

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

JUN 13 1951

*Dist*PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

CONTENTS

	PAGE
HOUGH, GRAHAM.—Some Coleridge Marginalia,	361
GWYNN, F. L.—Hopkins' "The Windhover": a New Simplification,	366
HULL, VERNAM.—Irish 'ruaim,'	370
WHITE, JAMES F.—Some Abridged Passages in 'Doktor Faustus,'	375
CAMPBELL, H. M.—The Hanging Scene in Melville's 'Billy Budd, Foretopman,'	378
TRAINOR, JULIETTE A.—Symbolism in 'A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court,'	382
WITT, MARION.—Yeats on the Poet Laureateship,	385
ANDERSON, CHARLES.—Cooper's Sea Novels Spurned in the Maintop,	388
BROWN, E. K.—The First Person in "Caliban upon Setebos,"	392
ANDERSON, CHARLES.—Lanier and Science: Addenda,	395
FUSSELL, E. S.—A Note on E. A. Robinson's "Credo,"	398
STEPANCHEV, STEPHEN.—The Origin of J. Alfred Prufrock,	400

REVIEWS:—

HEINRICH MEYER, Goethe das Leben im Werk. [G. O. L. Schuchard.]	401
G. L. BROOK (ed.), The Harley Lyrics. The Middle English Lyrics of MS. Harley 2253. [R. J. Schoeck.]	404
O. E. FELLOWS and N. L. TORREY (eds.), Diderot Studies. [L. G. Crooker.]	407
MARSHALL W. STEARNS, Robert Henryson. [H. M. Smyser.]	409
J. P. BOYD, L. H. BUTTERFIELD, and M. R. BRYAN (eds.), The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Vols. 1 and 2 (1760-1779). [R. B. Davis.]	412
J. G. SOUTHWORTH, Some Modern American Poets. [Arnold Stein.]	414
JACK LINDSAY, Charles Dickens. [Lionel Stevenson.]	416
MAURICE COLBOURNE, The Real Bernard Shaw. [Rudolf Stamm.]	418
J. J. RUBIN and C. H. BROWN (eds.), Walt Whitman of the New York Aurora. [R. G. Silver.]	419
NINO SCIVOLETTO, Fra Salimbene de Parma e la storia politica e religiosa del secolo decimoterzo. [Elio Gianturco.]	421
F. E. LITZ (ed.), Letters—Grave and Gay and Other Prose of John Banister Tabb. [D. M. McKeithan.]	422
C. M. KIRK and RUDOLF KIRK (eds.), William Dean Howells: Representative Selections. [Alexander Cowie.]	423
GEORGES ZINK, Les Légendes héroïques de Dietrich et d'Ermrich dans les littératures germaniques. [Archer Taylor.]	425
ERNST BEUTLER und JOSEFINE RUMPF (eds.), Bilder aus dem Frankfurter Goethe-Museum. [Wolfgang Stechow.]	426

BRIEF MENTION: JULIUS SCHWIDTERING (ed.), Zeitschrift für Deutsches Altertum und Deutsche Literatur; M. T. HERRICK, Comic Theory in the Sixteenth Century; <i>The Romanic Review</i> ,	427
--	-----

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER
KEMP MALONE

CHARLES R. ANDERSON
DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, R. D. Havens, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston,
Pedro Salinas, Arno Schirokauer, L. Spitzer, E. R. Wasserman

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: DNB., JEGP., MLN., MLR., MP., NED., PMLA., PQ., RR., SP., RES., TLS. Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

FRENCH TRAGEDY IN THE TIME OF LOUIS XV AND VOLTAIRE, 1715-1774

By H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

A sequel to the author's nine volume *History of French Dramatic Literature in the 17th Century*, and *Sunset, A History of Parisian Drama in the Last Years of Louis XIV, 1701-1715*, this study seeks to show how the work of Corneille and Racine was carried on or modified by their successors, Voltaire, La Motte, Piron, de Belloy, Lemierre, etc.

Reviewing the influence of Shakespeare and other English dramatists,

the internal causes leading to the substitution of romantic for classic tragedy, the extent to which Voltaire and others employed tragedy as a vehicle for political and religious propaganda, the author also discusses the actors and actresses of the Comédie Française, their theatre, their methods, their finances, and such striking figures as Michel Baron, Adrienne Le Cœur, Dumesnil, Clairon and Le Kain.

IN TWO VOLUMES — \$10.00

The Johns Hopkins Press



Baltimore 18, Maryland

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland. Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXVI

JUNE, 1951

Number 6

SOME COLERIDGE MARGINALIA

In the Johns Hopkins University Library is a copy of Hone's *New Testament Apocrypha*¹ of 1820, containing the bookplate of Alexander William Gillman, and stated in a bookseller's note² to have come from the library of Dr. James Gillman of Highgate, Coleridge's host during the later years of his life. The book has four marginal annotations in Coleridge's hand. One of these is signed S.T.C.

Hone was a bookseller and well-known Liberal pamphleteer.³ He also compiled and published a good deal of popular literature, and his version of the *Apocrypha* is one of these popular compilations. He was a sufficiently successful political satirist to be a thorn in the Tory flesh; and this book was savagely reviewed in the *Quarterly*⁴ in the best style of "two-bottle orthodoxy." Its scholarship is attacked, not without justification: but the burden of the onslaught is that the publication is a covert incitement to infidelity, because it equates the authority of these trivial and superstitious

¹ *The Apocryphal New Testament, being all The Gospels, Epistles, and other pieces now extant, attributed in the first four centuries to Jesus Christ, His apostles, and their companions, and not included in the New Testament by its compilers. Translated from the original tongues and now first collected into one volume.* London: printed for William Hone, Ludgate Hill. 1820.

² Letter of 9. March. 1831 from Maggs Bros., 34, Conduit St., New Bond St., London W., to Leonard L. Mackall Esq., by whom the book was bequeathed to Johns Hopkins. The letter is inserted in the back cover of the book. "This is one of the items which was originally in the library of Dr. James Gillman of Highgate, Coleridge's friend and benefactor, and was sold by Mrs. L. E. Watson, Grand-daughter of Dr. James Gillman."

³ v. *D.N.B.*

⁴ *Quarterly Review*, July 1821, and again Jan. 1824.

documents with that of the received New Testament canon. This is quite unjust. Hone's preface and notes obviously recommend by implication a critical attitude towards the biblical text; but certainly without the subversive and blasphemous intentions that are ascribed to him. Coleridge's own concern with these exegetical questions makes his annotations to Hone's work of some interest.

Coleridge of course scatters sporadic comments on the text of Scripture throughout his works; but the subject was perhaps particularly in his mind about 1824. It was at this time that he composed his own main pronouncement on the interpretation of Scripture, the *Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit* (posthumously published, but almost certainly written in this year).⁵ Hone's book was again in the news in 1824, because of a second *Quarterly* attack; and we may not unreasonably date Coleridge's annotations about this time.

The first note is to Hone's preface. Hone in a footnote comments on the well-known crux in I. Timothy. III. 16. "Great is the mystery of godliness. God was manifest in the flesh." He cites Sir Isaac Newton [!] on this passage, suggesting that the word God is spurious, arising from the transformation of δ into Θ , the abbreviation of $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$; so achieving the reading "God was manifest in the flesh" for "which was manifest in the flesh": i. e. giving a specific statement of the personal divinity of Christ which was not in the original text. Coleridge comments:

A. Strong grounds, I admit, for δ instead of $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, and if the syntax had allowed the masculine gender, $\Theta\varsigma$, it might easily have been mistaken for $\Theta\varsigma$. But δ , scarcely. On the other hand, the context and internal evidence are at least equally strong in favour of $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$. With δ (i. e. which mystery of Piety, (*εὐσεβείας* is badly translated "of Godliness") the text is flat & hardly intelligible!—But the Epistle itself is not a work of Paul's but of a later age—& were it otherwise it would prove no more than is asserted in 20 other places of the N.T.—viz. that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself and not Christ's personal divinity.⁶

Coleridge thus maintains that the reading represented by the Authorized Version is the most probable (thus satisfying the

⁵ v. J. Dykes Campbell. *Samuel Taylor Coleridge. A Narrative of the events of his life.* 2nd Edn., 1896, p. 254 n. Also L. E. Watson. *Coleridge at Highgate*, 1925, p. 100.

⁶ Coleridge. MS note to Hone p. xi.

demands of English orthodoxy), then improves on the translation himself (gratifying his own sense of scholarship and scrupulosity of language); then denies the authority of the Epistle altogether (indicating his acceptance of advanced textual criticism); and then says that it doesn't matter anyway, since on any interpretation the text would only prove what is shown in other passages *passim*. In point of fact δ is the best attested reading; and here, as in his dealings with the Shakespeare text, Coleridge's essay at textual criticism is cursory and impressionist. It is typical of his method of dealing with Scripture—great confidence, not particularly well-founded, in dealing with the letter of the text; but still greater eagerness to show that it proves nothing that cannot be proved by the spirit of the whole.

The second note is a comment on Hone's preface to the Gospel of the Birth of Mary. It repeats the *Quarterly* criticism of Hone, though of course it may be quite independent of this. The point of the criticism is that Hone seeks to identify the surviving text of which he prints a translation with a primitive gospel attributed to St. Matthew: whereas it was well-known that the original had disappeared and that the surviving text was late and spurious, and only surreptitiously inserted into Jerome's works.

B. Who would not from the prefatory note suppose that *this* very Gospel was found in Jerome, and that it was the same with the Gospel of the Nazarenes attributed to St. Matthew—and that this was now extant in Jerome's works? All which, however, are so many Blunders! Pity that Mr. Hone had not referred the Reader to the Vol. and Page of St. Jerome's works in which he or his collector found it. Why has Mr. Hone omitted to mention the Books from which he made these reprints?⁷

The next note is to the General Epistle of Barnabas. Hone's preface to this epistle says,

Cotelerius affirms that Origen and Jerome esteemed it genuine and canonical; but Cotelerius himself did not believe it to be either one or the other; on the contrary, he supposes it to be written for the benefit of the Ebionites, (the Christianised Jews) who were tenacious of rites and ceremonies. Bishop Fell feared to own expressly what he seemed to be persuaded of, that it ought to be treated with the same respect as several of the books of the present canon.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

Coleridge underlines "on the contrary," and adds the following note:

C. What is the logic of this? How does its having been written for so good and *Pauline* a purpose prove its spuriousness. The word "canonical" in this place is an ignorantia. Jerome could not think that a book was in the canon, which his own catalogue of canonical Scriptures does not contain: tho' he might think it worthy of a place. S.T.C.⁹

Below, and apparently written with the same pen as note A, appears the following prolonged note on the question of canonical and apocryphal Scriptures:

D. Apocryphal is a taking but likewise a *take-in* title of friend Hone's choosing. Extra-canonical Scriptures of or near to the Apostolic Age, would rightly designate the first Ep. of Clement, Barnabas, Hermas, and (with aid of indicative asterisks to distinguish the admitted interpolations from the doubtful passages and both from the probably genuine) Polycarp & Ignatius. The remainder deserve no other title but Spurious Gospels and Epistles of uncertain date, but later than the third century.—But I am, I confess, so far of Bishop Fell's mind as to wish, that the Gospel of the Infancy⁹ conincorporate with our first Gospel, that prefixed to the third, the last chapter of the 2nd., the latter half of the last chapter of the 4th. Gospel, the first Epistle to Timothy (if not rather all three of the Pastoral Epistles; and the Apocalypse had formed an intermediate canon between the New Testament and these of Clement, & Barnabas, as having less evident internal marks of Catholicity—N.B. This would not deny that they were *Θεοπνευσται γραφαι*; but simply that the inspiration was episcopal, i. e. for particular times and occasions, not apostolic i. e. for the Universal Church of all ages, and consequently that these Scriptures of the lower canon were sources of edification, and of direction by accommodation according to the analogy of circumstances—and not like the superior canon, measures of Faith and Practice absolutely. The same division into canonical of the first and canonical of the second order I would have applied likewise to the Books of the Old Testament.¹⁰

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 122.

⁹ This does not refer to the Gospel of the Infancy printed by Hone (which is a manifestly spurious collection of tales of sorcery) but to the early chapters of Matthew's Gospel referring to the infancy of Christ. By "the Gospel of the Infancy conincorporate with our first Gospel, and that prefixed to the third" Coleridge apparently means Matthew Chapters 1 and 2 and the parallel Luke Chapters 1 and 2, which he regards as of different authority from the rest of the Gospels.

¹⁰ Coleridge. MS note to Hone p. 122. The note extends from p. 122 to p. 129.

Now the whole purpose of the *Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit* is to recommend the idea of *degrees* of inspiration in the Scriptures, as against what Coleridge believes to be the superstition of verbal inspiration.¹¹ It was addressed to a friend (actually a nephew), but to judge by its completeness and orderly presentation, was also probably intended for eventual publication. The fact that Coleridge did not publish it during his lifetime suggests that he thought its conclusions too bold for his day. Indeed, very similar opinions were to arouse a furore when expressed in *Essays and Reviews* in 1860. It has been rightly said that the *Confessions* contains within it the germs of the coming higher criticism.¹² But with characteristic scrupulosity Coleridge does not, in a communication intended for others, do more than present a general line of approach to the interpretation of Scripture. He does nothing to cast any doubt on the authority of any part of the received New Testament text, or to assign to any part of it a lower place than it occupies in the general estimation. It seems that we have here in note D some of the detail on which the general view recommended in the *Confessions* is based. We do not gather from Coleridge's notes what critical considerations led him to single out these particular New Testament passages for relegation to a lower canon, though doubtless those familiar with the history of Biblical criticism could enlighten us on this point: but it is clear that Coleridge is already entertaining a cautious and modified doubt of the complete authority even of certain portions of the Gospels. This note, then, is a more specific exemplification than Coleridge thought fit to publish of his method of approaching Scripture, with all the safeguards of piety indeed, but also in the spirit of critical enquiry with which he would approach any other ancient literature.

GRAHAM HOUGH

The Johns Hopkins University

¹¹ The sub-title of the *Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit* is "Letters on the Inspiration of the Scriptures": and a prefatory note says that in them "The Writer submissively discloses his own private judgment on the following Question: I. Is it necessary or expedient, to insist on the belief of the divine origin and authority of all, and every part of the Canonical Books as the condition, or first principle of Christian faith . . . ?"

¹² v. J. C. Shairp. *Studies in Poetry and Philosophy*, 1868, p. 261.

HOPKINS' "THE WINDHOVER": A NEW SIMPLIFICATION

Of the many interpretations of Hopkins' complex sonnet, none is completely satisfactory to every reader.¹ This is because (1) the poem is a good one, and therefore gives relative satisfactions to our several relative demands; and (2) the poem is obscure, and therefore inevitably enlists ingenuity that verges on speciousness. But most of the trouble has come from our failure to keep our eyes on the bird in the poem: we are either diverted by metaphor and concentrate on the bird as "dauphin" and "chevalier," or we leap to the poet and explore his "heart in hiding." In short, we stress the literary and religious implications of the poem rather than—as Hopkins did—the inscape of the bird.

No critic, for example, has exploited the fact that this Falcon dives in the poem,² that the final meaning depends on our seeing and feeling this dive. Once we are thus aware, the crucial and much-discussed words of the sestet become more clear and consistent, and the whole sonnet takes on a simplicity, visual as well as grammatical.

Let us consider what Hopkins' bird is and does. "Windhover" is not the poet's vivid neologism, but an accepted British name for the kestrel, a small (about a foot long) European hawk noted for turning its head into the wind and hovering in the same position by beating its wings rapidly. Hopkins approximates this rhythmical action by the rhythmical phrase "riding/Of the rolling level underneath him steady air." He then says that the Falcon "rung"—a technical term from the sport of falconry to describe spiral climbing (*NED.*, "Ring," v. 1. b); this is the bird's second action in the poem. The third action is its leaving off climbing for

¹ The most logical, comprehensive, and religious treatment to date is Raymond V. Schoder, S. J., "What Does *The Windhover* Mean?" *Immortal Diamond: Studies in Gerard Manley Hopkins*, ed. Norman Weyand, S. J. (1949). Father Schoder first convincingly shows the inadequacies of previous explications.

² John Pick mentions (*Gerard Manley Hopkins: Priest and Poet*, 1942, p. 71) the Falcon's "act of 'buckling,' when the windhover swoops down, when its flight is crumpled," but he goes on to interpret this as an act of "mystical self-immolation"—hardly the natural function of a bird of prey.

"gliding," going "off forth on swing." At this point the poet breaks off description and praises "the achieve of, the mastery of the thing."

But hawks have another aerial activity: they feed off animal life which they procure by diving on it. (The windhover eats mice, beetles, grasshoppers, etc.) Such diving, called "stooping," necessitates the partial folding of the elbows and wrists of the wings, so that the hawk may increase its gravitational speed yet still be able to flex its wings quickly and pull out of the dive when it seizes its prey. It is indeed an act of "Brute beauty."³

And it is this act that line 9 of Hopkins' poem embodies.⁴ After hovering, ringing, and gliding in the octave, the bird dives—in spectacular contrast—in the first half of the sestet. The sprung rhythm and punctuation of line 9 empathetically reproduce first the "push-over" (as dive-bombers call it) at the top of the dive, and then the increasing gravitational speed of the dive itself. When one reads aloud (as Hopkins wanted us to) "Brute beauty and valour and act"—joined by "and's" as it is—one feels the gathering of the hawk's animal beauty and courage and activity just before the lethal plunge. And then, "oh," the dive itself, imitated in steady, relentless, stressed monosyllables carefully separated by commas to stretch out the descent. "Here" means "here in the dive"; "Buckle" means "gather in compactly," the simplest possible use of the word (*NED.*, v. 1: "To fasten with a buckle"). The mood of "Buckle" is *both* indicative and imperative.⁵

Hopkins, overwhelmed by the beauty of this inscape, leaves the

³ Falconry is a brutal sport to many, and there is some consolation in knowing that the windhover is too small to be trained for the pastime. Indeed, Hopkins' calling his bird a "Falcon" can be considered metaphorical, since custom once restricted the term to the larger sporting birds.

⁴ I owe this suggestion to Miss Sarah Mitchell.

⁵ This is an arbitrary solution. It is difficult to deny Father Schoder's contention (*Immortal Diamond*, p. 297) that the verb is imperative because the comma (after "plume") "has no place between an imperative and its *object*." Yet it is perfectly possible that Hopkins is writing in the exclamatory indicative, utilizing the comma to slow down the speed of the reading and thereby to stretch the dive of the bird. And it is further possible that Hopkins' frenzied line, which attempts to catch six abstractions in the motion and speed of actual flight, may also strive for simultaneity by combining in the verb "Buckle" *both* ecstatic exhortation (imperative) and appreciative comment (indicative).

kestrel in its dive, concluding that this fiery act of stooping is much "lovelier" and "more dangerous" than "the achieve of" hovering, ringing, and gliding. In the last half of the sestet (separated from the first half by a space) he slows the movement down to bolster his appreciation with two calmer analogies to the "fire" of the hawk's dive—the frictional polishing of a ploughshare in use and the sparks from embers.

Commentators have had a hard job connecting the bird, the plough, and the embers. But if we have the hawk's dive in our minds, we can see clearly why the plough shines "down" and the embers "fall."

Of the two comparisons, the second is plain enough: the "fire that breaks from" pieces of wood is "lovelier, more dangerous" when the pieces "fall" from the logs in colorful single descent than when they are burning as part of the horizontal log.

But the first analogy is more difficult; what is the meaning of "shéer plód makes plough down sillion / Shine"? Most explicators translate this as: even such a dull activity as the mere plodding of someone ploughing along furrows ("sillion") has a fire about it, either from the sheen of freshly turned earth, the sparks produced by the striking of the plough against rocks, or the polished gleam of the ploughshare being used in its proper function. But this explanation reveals no relationship of ploughing to such spectacular pyrotechnics as the gashing of embers, which is supposed to be a parallel analogy, or the diving of the hawk, which is supposed to be illuminated by the figure of ploughing. And there are five reasons for this *cul-de-sac*: (1) failing to catch Hopkins' inscape of "plough," (2) taking "shéer" in only one sense, (3) under-emphasizing "down," (4) over-emphasizing "plód," and (5) taking a too literal meaning for "sillion."

(1) In a poem about a bird Hopkins never would have jumped from bird to plough without seeing a resemblance between the inscapes⁶ of the two. And that resemblance here is the similarity between the curved wedged blade of a plough, streamlined to dig

⁶ I use "inscape" as defined by W. A. M. Peters (*Gerard Manley Hopkins: a Critical Essay towards the Understanding of his Poetry*, 1948, p. 1): "the unified complex of those sensible qualities of the object of perception that strike us as inseparably belonging to and most typical of it . . .," and as amplified by Peters, ff.

into the earth with least resistance, and the body and wings of a bird, streamlined to dig into the air, especially when diving, with least resistance.

(2) Most commentators take "shéer" in its vulgar usage as an intensive expletive dissociating its noun from all other considerations, as in "sheer nonsense." But there are secondary meanings, more concrete and intense, that would have occurred to the philologist Hopkins. The most vivid sense is "perpendicular," as in "sheer cliff," which carries the feeling of swift descent to correspond to the hawk's diving. The most interesting sense is the obsolete "pure, bright" (from ME *schere*, OE *scaere*, ON *skaer*), an undertone that bolsters the fire imagery of the sestet, especially since it is joined with "Shine" by alliteration. And finally, "shéer" paronomastically supplies the "-share" missing from "plough-," giving us the bright, sharp shearing blade that cuts into the earth (as the hawk cuts into the air), instead of the irrelevant handles, beam, horse, and ploughman conjured up by the mere notion of ploughing.

(3) "Down" has as much vertical as horizontal force, to correspond to the hawk's dive and the embers' "Fall."

(4) Most explicators emphasize the connotation of weariness in "plód," possibly with Gray's "The ploughman homeward plods his weary way" in mind. Although it is impossible to deny a feeling of laboriousness to the word, I think that Hopkins was primarily interested in getting a noun (or participle) conveying simply forward motion at the same time that it strengthens "plough down" by both initial and final alliteration.

(5) "Sillion" (obsolete for "selion") does not mean "furrow" (as in Fr. *sillon*), but (*NED.*) "a narrow strip lying between two furrows formed in dividing an open field, a 'narrow land'"; (*The English Dialect Dictionary*) "A certain portion of land, a strip of ploughed land"; in short, an indeterminate parcel of arable land adjacent to other such selions.⁷ Hopkins uses the lovely obsolete word (varying it handily to rhyme with "billion") simply to denote land under cultivation.

And so the troublesome analogy of the plough should be para-

⁷ See *Notes and Queries*, First Series, IV (1851), 258.

phrased thus: the (utter, steep, bright, sharp) progress of a ploughshare through the earth makes it shine—even as the dive of a bird (which looks and acts something like a ploughshare) through the air produces a fire.

The sonnet then goes on to the final analogy of the falling embers. But these last six lines of comparison should not make us forget that the *whole* poem is about a bird. Gerard Manley Hopkins once saw a kestrel in the wind, first hovering, then ringing, and then gliding, and it seemed wonderful. But when the hawk dived, the poet saw an even superior achievement, and he did his best to give us images of this intangible beauty. His best was not perfect, but it is enormously good when we have first seen exactly what he saw: namely (in the octave), a hawk on the wind, and (in the sestet), a hawk, a plough and some embers flaming in their descent.

FREDERICK L. GWYNN

The Pennsylvania State College

IRISH *RUAIM*

"What is *ruaim*?" I asked Master Séan O'Daly one day in the autumn of 1932 while he was giving me instruction in Modern Irish on the strand of Dunquin in West Kerry.

"O," he replied, "that, I believe, is some sort of dye stuff. I'm not sure, but I'll inquire of the old women in the parish just what it is. When I've found out, I'll make it the subject of a composition for you."

I had a reason for asking him about *ruaim*. Although this word already is attested in Old Irish,¹ no good defining quotations exist since everyone at that time knew what it meant. The same situation holds equally true for the later periods of the language; indeed, it was not until some fifty years or more ago that *ruaim* ceased to be produced. As, consequently, there are no good defining quotations, one is now dependent for the meaning of this word on such

¹ Spelled *ruam*, it is recorded, for example, in Cormac's Glossary, sec. 1094; cf. W. Stokes, "On the Bodleian Fragment of Cormac's Glossary," *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1891-94, p. 188. To judge by its declension in Modern Irish, *ruaim* originally was a neuter *n*-stem.

information as can be gleaned from dictionaries and general works of reference. Apart from the all too brief definitions in the dictionaries,² the only detailed discussion of *ruaim* that is familiar to me occurs in Eugene O'Curry's *On the Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*,³ but unfortunately this work of reference does not supply any corroborative evidence for the statements that it contains regarding the production of *ruaim*. Such being the case, I naturally was interested in obtaining further information, even if that information was drawn from more or less contemporary sources, for in all likelihood the methods that prevailed in the preparation of *ruaim* at the outset suffered little modification in the course of the centuries. I, therefore, was delighted when upon meeting Master Séan O'Daly on the strand of Dunquin during the morning of October 17, 1932, about a week after my query, he informed me that he was ready to dictate a composition about *ruaim* to me. At his dictation I took down verbatim the following account:

Dath crón is eadh ruaim. Do-bhaineadh na mná tighe ruaim as préamhachaibh sceach agus as sméara dubha a bhíodh ag fás ar na sceachaibh insa bhfóghmhar. Do-bhainidís barraidheacha na sceach leis chuinn na ruama do dhéanamh. Do-bhaineadh na fir préamhacha na sceach le raimhinibh agus do-ghearraidís na sméara dubha agus barraidheacha na sceach le corránaibh.

Do-chuireadh na mná tighe annsan uisce ag beirbhiughudh ar an dteine i georcán mór, agus nuair a bhíodh an t-uisce ag fliuchaigh do-chuiridís na préamhacha agus na sméara dubha agus na barraidheacha isteach insan uisce ag fliuchaigh agus d'fhágaidís ann iad go dtí go mbaineadh an fliuchadh an súghlach go binn asta.

Do-chuiridís annsan piosa dhe phlainnín bhán isteach síos insa chorcán agus d'fhágaidís ann é riamh agus choidheche go dtí go bhfeicidís go mbíodh ruaim na bpréamhacha agus na sméara agus bharraidheacha na sceach dulta isteach insa phlainnín go feile-bhínn.

Do-bhíodh dath crón annsan aran bplainnín ón ruaim. Adhbhar cóta plainnín do-chuireadh na mná insa ruaim, agus nuair a bhíodh sé dathuighthe i gearrta aca insa ruaim dath crón do-bhíodh ar adhbhar an chóta.

Do-chuiridís coparós annsan isteach insan chorcán agus d'fhágaidís an piosa plainnín insa chorcán ar feadh tamaill eile, agus do-thugadh an coparós dath dubh ar an éadach. Ní bhíodh aon dath crón annsan ar an éadach. Bhíodh sé dubh ar fad ag an coparós.

² Such as *Contributions to a Dictionary of the Irish Language*, ed. Maud Joynt, Dublin and London, 1944, col. 108 s.v. 4. *ruam*.

³ London [etc.], 1873, I, cccv; III, 119.

Ach do-thréigeadh an dath dubh ana-thapaidh ar fad, agus cad do-dheineadh na mná tighe ná bhód a chur insa chorcán i dteannta an choparóis, agus annsan ní thréigeadh an dath dubh a bhfodh ar an éadach i n-ao' chur. D'fhanadh sé dubh i gcomhnaidhe nuair a bhfodh sé 'n-a chótaí ar na mnaibh tighe. Ní chailleadh sé a dhath i n-ao' chur.

Do-chuireadh na mná tighe leis píosaf bréide isteach insa ruaim, agus do-chuiridís coparós agus bhód farais an ruaim, agus d'fhágaidís ann iad go dtí go mbfodh na píosaf bréide dathuighthe ana-dhubh. Nuair a bhfódís dathuighthe ar a dtoil aca, do-dheineadh na fir casóga móra bréide dhe sna píosaf nuair a bhfódís dathuighthe go slachtmhar. Bhfódh ana-bhuanchas insa casóga bréide céadna nuair a bhfódís dathuighthe i gceart.

Tá sé suas le trí fichid bliadhán anois ó stad na daoine insan áit seo ar fad ó bheith ag baint aon phréamheacha sceach ná sméara ná barraidheacha sceach chuin ruama do dhéanamh. Nuair a theastuigheann ó sna mná tighe aon phíosaf plainnín do dhathughadh insa lá atá indiu ann chuin cótaí dubha do dhéanamh de, is amhlaidh a cheannuigheann siad coparós agus bhód insa Daingean chuin go mbeadh cótaí dubha aca á chaitheamh. Níl aon eolas riamh aca ar aon ruaim a bhaint as na sceacha. Níor chualadar riamh aoinní mar gheall air, agus ní dheineann siad ach sádhadh go dtí an siopa agus díol as an coparós agus as an bhód chomh maith. Ba bhuaine go mór cótaí dubha na ruama ná cótaí dubha an lae indiu ná bíonn aon ruaim ionnta.

Nuair a cuirtear bhód ar an éadach, ní liathann sé i n-ao' chur. (Ní chailleann sé a dhath.) Níl aon chótaí plainnín á chaitheamh age furmhór na mban atá ar an saoghal anois mar deir siad go bhfuil siad ana-chomónta ar fad. Is fearr leotha go mór cótaí do cheannach insa t-siopa agus díol go daor asta ná cótaí plainnín do dhéanamh dóibh féin age baile ar bheagán costais. Is dóigh leo gur galánta go mór cótaí an t-siopa ná na cótaí plainnín. Ní beag san do dhíth céille ortha! Agus dar ndóigh tá's ag an saoghal gur bhuaine go mór na cótaí plainnín a dheineadh na mná tighe dhóibh féin 'sa t-seana-shaoghal ná na cótaí a cheannuigheann na mná indiu insa t-siopa. Níl i gcótaí an t-siopa ach scráimín éadaig gan mhaith gan tairbhe gan buanchas.

For the benefit of those who may be unfamiliar with Modern Irish I append a literal translation of the foregoing account:⁴

Ruaim is saffron-colored. Housewives make *ruaim* from the roots of briars and from the blackberries which grew on the briars in the autumn. In order to make *ruaim* they also cut the tops of the briars. The men dug up the roots of the briars with spades and cut off the blackberries and the tops of the briars with reaping hooks.

The housewives thereupon set water to boil on the fire in a large pot, and when the water was boiling they put the roots and the blackberries

⁴ To Professor Séamus Kavanagh I am indebted for a number of valuable suggestions in connection with the ensuing rendition.

and the tops into the boiling water and left them there until the process of boiling had extracted the liquid essence entirely from them.

Then they put a piece of white flannel down into the pot and left it there continuously until they saw that the *ruaim* of the roots and of the berries and of the tops of the briars had penetrated wholly the flannel.

Subsequently there was a saffron color on the flannel from the *ruaim*. Into the *ruaim* the women put material for flannel petticoats, and when it was properly dyed by them the material for the petticoat was saffron-colored.

Thereupon they put copperas into the pot and left the piece of flannel in the pot during a further period of time, and the copperas imparted a black color to the garment. On the garment thereafter there was not any saffron color. It was completely blackened by the copperas.

But very quickly the black color faded wholly, and what did the housewives do but put woad into the pot together with the copperas, and then the black color that was on the garment did not fade at all. It remained always black when it served as a petticoat for the housewives. It never lost its color.

The housewives also put pieces of frieze into the *ruaim*, adding copperas and woad to the *ruaim*, and left them therein until the pieces of frieze were dyed very black. When they were dyed according to their wish, the men made overcoats of frieze from the pieces after they had been deftly dyed. When they were properly dyed, there was great durability in those same coats of frieze.

It is now upwards of sixty years since the people in this locality ceased entirely from cutting any roots of briars or berries or tops of briars in order to make *ruaim*. When the housewives want to dye any pieces of flannel at the present day in order to make black petticoats thereof, they purchase copperas and woad in Dingle so that they might have black petticoats to wear. They do not know at all how to make any *ruaim* from briars. Never have they heard anything about it, and all they do is to rush to the shop and pay for the copperas and for the woad as well. The black petticoats of *ruaim* were very much more lasting than the present-day black petticoats in which there is not any *ruaim*.

When woad is put on the garment, it does not fade at all. (It does not lose its color.) Most of the women who are now alive do not wear any flannel petticoats because they say that as a whole they are very common. They much prefer to buy petticoats in the shop and to pay dearly for them rather than to make flannel petticoats at home at small cost. They imagine that the shop petticoats are very much more fashionable than the flannel petticoats. Foolish people that they are! ⁵ And the world, of course, knows that the flannel petticoats which the housewives made for themselves in former times were very much more lasting than the petticoats that the women buy today in the shop. In shop petticoats there

⁵ Literally, "That is not small of the want of sense on them."

exists only shoddy material for a garment without worth, without benefit, and without durability.

A comparison of the foregoing account by Séan O'Daly with the account by Eugene O'Curry in his work entitled *On the Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*,⁶ taken together with the supplementary remarks thereto in the introduction by W. K. Sullivan,⁷ indicates that both accounts at least agree in defining *ruaim* as a term which is strictly applicable only to the first dye stuff. They disagree markedly, however, with respect to the substances from which this base was produced. According to O'Daly, the base was extracted from the roots and the tops of briars, as well as from the blackberries growing on the briars. So, too, according to O'Curry and Sullivan the base was concocted from various materials. Yet apart from the roots of the bramble, which apparently are equivalent to O'Daly's roots of the briar, they do not refer to the tops of briars or to the blackberries growing on these briars as sources for *ruaim*. On the other hand, they do refer to other sources, namely, the twigs of the alder tree, the buck bean, and even the common sorrel, none of which O'Daly mentions. In the main these two accounts also disagree regarding the constituents from which the black dye that was superimposed on the *ruaim* was obtained. O'Daly asserts that copperas was the constituent and that thereto was added woad in order to preserve the color from fading.⁸ Although O'Curry and Sullivan make no reference to woad as a mordant, they do admit that in comparatively recent times copperas, as well as logwood, provided the black dye. At the same time they explicitly state that formerly "bog stuff," that is, peaty mud, supplied the desired black color and that this color was improved by the addition of oak chips or twigs.

Since the two preceding accounts are discrepant in a number of particulars regarding the ingredients from which *ruaim* and the superimposed black dye were derived, the question may well be raised why this discrepancy occurs. The answer to the question obviously resides in the fact that each district of Ireland made

⁶ III, 119.

⁷ I, ccccv.

⁸ In Tomás Ó Criomhthain's *An T-Oileánach* (Dublin, 1929), p. 83, woad—not copperas—is said to have been applied to flannel after the flannel had been dipped in *ruaim*.

use of those natural resources which were immediately available. In that connection it should be noted that O'Daly's account is definitely confined to the southwestern part of the country; the account of O'Curry and Sullivan, on the contrary, would seem to embrace the whole of the island. At all events, whatever the substances that were employed may have been and however much they may have varied from region to region, at least there is no doubt that the term *ruaim* signified the first dye, base, or ground in the process of dyeing and that this once preliminary step in the process now has been abandoned according to O'Daly for well over a half century.

VERNAM HULL

Harvard University

SOME ABRIDGED PASSAGES IN *DOKTOR FAUSTUS*

When the time eventually comes for a definitive edition of Thomas Mann to be undertaken, the editors will have no small task in establishing valid texts. Where the manuscripts no longer exist, as is the case for *Buddenbrooks* and *Der Zauberberg*—to name only the two greatest gaps—, they will find that the existing editions vary among themselves in orthography and punctuation. Typographical errors are not infrequent and keep cropping up as old ones are corrected in later editions. By and large, however, the body of text for the novels and stories has remained substantially unaltered except for minor orthographical modifications and changes in chapter numbering. On the other hand, the essayistic prose works, especially recent ones, often appear in abridged, expanded, or otherwise altered forms. Mann constantly revises and, when he does so, usually shortens. There is, however, now one piece of narrative prose which has suffered abridgement in contrast to its earlier published form: the novel *Doktor Faustus*. While no one will greatly miss the passages that have been excised from it, nevertheless their absence should at least be noted.

Not the least interesting part of the author's account¹ of the

¹ Thomas Mann, *Die Entstehung des Doktor Faustus. Roman eines Romans* (Stockholm: Bermann-Fischer Verlag, 1949), hereafter cited as EdDF.

writing of *Doktor Faustus* is concerned with the great amount of revising and abridgement that he did before the text went to the printer. He seems never to have been quite satisfied with chapter VIII (Kretschmar's lectures), "dieses fatale Stück,"² and it is in this chapter that the most recent excisions were made. Chapter VIII was "vorläufig abgeschlossen" in the latter part of September, 1943;³ but revisions of it are mentioned as having taken place in December of that year and in June and August of 1946.⁴ This last revision involved abridgement in roughly the first three-fourths of the novel and only a minimum of re-writing to bridge the gaps. The author tells us that with the help of his daughter Erika he shortened by some forty sheets the typescript which he had asked the English translator, Mrs. Lowe-Porter, temporarily to return to him.⁵ Of this major revision he says:

Gewisse Eingriffe galten noch wieder dem Kapitel von Kretschmar-Vorträgen; Musik-Theoretisches ging über Bord; die Studentengespräche wurden gekappt, das Schwelgen in Bentano-Liedern eingedämmt, aus der Halle-Theologie ein ganzer Professor mitsamt seinem Kolleg hinausgeworfen.⁶

It should be remembered that these excisions were made in the German typescript from which came the English translation and presumably also the text for the German editions. This revision established a text for all but the final chapters. During the summer of 1947, Mann was in Switzerland and read the proofsheets of the German edition⁷ as they came from the printer in Winterthur.⁸ In order to preserve the American copyright it had been necessary to publish a limited mimeographed German edition in New York.⁹ Except for its many typographical errors, it seems not to differ textually from the Bermann-Fischer edition (DFF) and need not

² *Ibid.*, 63.

³ *Ibid.*, 52.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 63, 166, 179.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 179.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Thomas Mann, *Doktor Faustus, Das Leben des deutschen Tonsetzers Adrian Leverkühn, erzählt von einem Freunde* (Stockholm: Bermann-Fischer Verlag, 1947), hereafter cited as DFF.

⁸ EdDF, 203 f.

⁹ Thomas Mann, *Doktor Faustus* [etc.] Sonderausgabe auf fünfzig Exemplare beschränkt (Mimeographed) (New York: Bermann-Fischer-Verlag, Stockholm, Copyright 1947, by Thomas Mann).

be considered here. Somewhere along the line a misunderstanding appears to have occurred; for in some way nine passages totalling some six pages in Chapter VIII appear in DFF, but have no counterpart in the English translation (DFE).¹⁰ Evidently, Mann did not intend to publish them; for—though they continue to appear in subsequent editions of Bermann-Fischer—the edition for Germany of the Suhrkamp-Verlag (DFS)¹¹ omits all but one of them. This is the reverse of the situation in regard to the omission of one of Echo's prayers from DFF and DFS (but translated in DFE) to which I have called attention elsewhere.¹² With the exception noted, all of the following passages are in DFF, but do not appear in the English translation (DFE), nor in DFS:

1. DFF, 89, line 15 (in the paragraph beginning "Beethoven also, . . ."): "—und eine Streitfrage blieb, . . ." through line 21: ". . . zu reinigen." DFS, 93, has a period after the previous word: "Streitfrage," where DFF has a comma.
2. DFF, 91, lines 14-22: the paragraph beginning "Wir kannten sie nicht, . . ." and ending ". . . eingeprägt hatte." has no counterpart in the English translation (DFE, 58), but appears in DFS, 95.
3. DFF, 91, line 23: "Auch das "Monstrum aller Quartett-Musik . . ." through pages 92 and 93 to 94, line 16, ending: ". . . gepriesen habe.—".
4. DFF, 94, line 26: "Dass aber meinen Freund . . ." through line 35 in the next paragraph, ending: ". . . wie das Adri Leverkühns." There is no indentation for paragraph in DFS and DFE.
5. DFF, 98, line 2 from the bottom: "Tatsächlich gäbe es Musik, . . ." through 99, line 8: "in reiner Abstraktheit."
6. DFF, 99 line 27 ends: "und das sei das Klavier." DFS and DFE omit the passage beginning in line 28 with "Über dieses erging er sich . . ." and running through DFF, 100, line 25: "Und also soviel denn für heute über. . . ." DFF, 100, line 25 continues: "ein Instrument, das ein solches . . ." DFS bridges the gap by combining what precedes and follows into one sentence, viz. ". . . und das sei das Klavier, ein Instrument, das ein solches im Sinne der anderen

¹⁰ Thomas Mann, *Doctor Faustus*, The Life of the German Composer Adrian Leverkühn, As Told by a Friend. Translated from the German by H. T. Lowe-Porter (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948), hereafter cited as DFE.

¹¹ Thomas Mann, *Doktor Faustus* [etc.] (Berlin und Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag vorm. S. Fischer, 1948), hereafter cited as DFS.

¹² "Echo's Prayers" in *Monatshefte*, XLII, no. 8, Dec. 1950, pp. 385-394.

gar nicht sei . . .," DFS, 101. DFE, 61, also bridges the gap in a single sentence.

7. DFF, 102, line 17, beginning "... , wobei nur die nächstliegenden verwandten Tonarten ..." and ending, line 29, "... für den Empfang Gottes." DFS has a period after the previous word: "Dreiklänge," 102.
8. DFF, 103, line 3 (beginning of the paragraph): "Er ging weiter . . ." through line 27, "... in diese Zustände zurückzukehren." DFS, 103, and DFE, 63, begin the paragraph with the next sentence: "Ja, rief der Vortragende. . ."
9. DFF, 109, line 11 (beginning of the paragraph): "In Ephrata sei . . ." through line 18, "... diesen Gesang vergessen." The next sentence begins in DFF: "Sein Vater, erzählte Kretschmar, habe ihm als junger Mann noch öfters lauschen können. . . ." DFE, 66, was evidently translated from the same text as is found in DFS, 109, where the paragraph begins: "Sein Vater, erzählte Kretschmar, habe diesen Klängen noch öfters lauschen können."

I should not care to hazard a guess about how these inconsistencies happened to occur. Nor do I know that they are the only ones—aside from the missing prayer already mentioned. It seems safe to say that purchasers of the Stockholm-edition certainly obtained more text than is found in others, more than in the English version, and probably some six pages more than the author intended to publish.

JAMES F. WHITE

Cornell University

THE HANGING SCENE IN MELVILLE'S *BILLY BUDD*, FORETOPMAN

Only two critics, and they very sketchily, have directly protested against the theory that Melville ended *Billy Budd* at peace with God and the world, if not actually happy over the cosmic situation. Mr. Joseph Schiffman has recognized the underlying ironic pessimism in *Billy Budd*, but his evidence is limited pretty well to the statement that Billy Budd's "God bless Captain Vere" is an ironical statement (on Melville's part of course), at which "the reader gags," and then, as the assembled crew repeat these words after Billy, they (ironically) intend to bless Billy, instead of Captain Vere. "Billy dies in helpless defeat," says Mr. Schiffman,

"only to become ironically reincarnated in the ballad as a living symbol for all sailors."¹ Mr. Alfred Kazin has also protested against the "acceptance" theory, but he says only that in *Billy Budd* Melville "had obviously agreed to accept the whole mysterious creation at last, with the weariness of an old man for whom all questions of justice end in death. . . . But it does not follow from this that he forgave God for just possibly not existing."²

Mr. Richard Chase has also protested, somewhat deviously, against the "acceptance" theory, but he misses the whole point of Melville's stupendous irony because he thinks that Melville tried but failed as an artist to work out a satisfactory tragic view of life in that Billy is not a tragic hero: ". . . he [Billy] has not even the humanity of adolescence."³ "There is," says Mr. Chase,

no "palatial stage" in his [Billy's] personality, no conscious structure, no mind whose disintegration we should watch with pity and terror rather than merely with bewilderment and an obscure sense of loss.⁴

But Melville was not trying to create a "tragic" hero in Mr. Chase's sense of the term; he had already done that in Ahab and, to some extent, in Pierre, and the critics had condemned his cosmic pessimism as unwarranted since such "tragic" heroes invite their own fate by their own willful errors. Melville's reply was to create Billy Budd, in whose tragedy is dramatically exhibited Melville's belief that in a universe like ours not even a Christ-like innocence is any protection against universal doom.

The overwhelming evidence for the ironical pessimism of Melville in *Billy Budd* lies in the final hanging scene, which the above critics have not analyzed and which all other critics seem to have construed as pointing to Melville's serene "acceptance" or positive cosmic optimism. Let us consider, in the first place, the Biblical symbolism. At the moment of the hanging "it chanced," says Melville, "that the vapory fleece hanging low in the East, was shot through with a soft glory as of the fleece of the Lamb of God seen in mystical

¹ "Melville's Final Stage, Irony," *American Literature*, xxii (May, 1950), 133, 135.

² "Ishmael in His Academic Heaven," *New Yorker* (Feb. 12, 1949), 77.

³ "Dissent on Billy Budd," *Partisan Review*, xv (November, 1948), 1212, 1213.

⁴ *Herman Melville* (New York, 1949), pp. 271-272.

vision. . . ."⁵ This beautiful language seems at first to create a religious atmosphere like Wordsworth's "It is a beauteous evening calm and free," but we cannot forget that in *Billy Budd* we are faced, not with an idyllic reference to a carefree child strolling beside the author, but with a horrible scene at the human level, the horror of which may well be intensified by the contrasting "soft glory" of the background. But of course Mr. Freeman and all the other advocates of the "acceptance" theory have more evidence than that for the "ascending note of hope." Melville says that "Billy ascended; and ascending, took the full rose of the dawn."⁶ Undoubtedly there is a symbolical reference to the ascension of Christ, and Billy in his innocence and simplicity is somewhat like Christ. But to what does Billy ascend? Mr. Freeman says it was "into the calm sky of the rising sun."⁷ But Melville certainly does not say this. The only reference to the conclusion of the "ascension" comes clearly and directly in the very next sentence, which begins, "In the pinioned figure arrived at the yard-end. . . ."⁸ The "arrival" is considerably this side of heaven or heaven's gate. We are thus brought abruptly back to the ironical realization that the ascension is only to the yard-end as the dead body is hauled up, and the peaceful beauty in the "full rose of the dawn" by contrast makes this solemn fact all the more horribly evident.

Melville seems to have been afraid that some would miss this powerful irony if he stressed the religious aspect of the symbolism too heavily, so he made several significant changes in the final version of the story. In the short-story version entitled "Baby Budd, Sailor" Melville says that Billy "ascending, took the full shekinah of the dawn";⁹ this becomes the "full rose of the dawn" in the final novel version and removes the strongly religious word *shekinah*. The next description after the hanging scene in the short-story version begins: "The silence accompanying the ascension . . .";¹⁰ this in the final version becomes "The silence at the moment of execution. . . ."¹¹ Melville was undoubtedly toning

⁵ Melville's *Billy Budd*, ed. F. Barron Freeman, pp. 265-266.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 266.

⁷ Introduction to *ibid.*, p. 126.

⁸ Melville's *Billy Budd*, p. 266.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 339.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 340.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 269.

down the religious symbolism. The reason, I believe, was that he wanted to have just enough to point up the irony; too much would obscure it.

Even more significant in this connection is one of the chapters which did not appear at all in the short-story version but was added in the final version. In the last chapter the superstitious and ignorant sailors preserve for many years the spar from which Billy was suspended, and "To them a chip of it was as a piece of the Cross."¹² These, if anybody, might be expected to maintain that Billy was safe in heaven, but the epilogue, containing the "ballad"¹³ supposedly written by one of Billy's shipmates, is a completely realistic version of the tragedy. In the words of the poem, Billy, commenting on his own fate, uses no religious language except to say that it was good of the chaplain to pray for him. There is the simple reference to "the running of me up,"¹⁴ after which there will be a long descent, "Fathoms down, fathoms down,"¹⁵ and a final sleep where "the oozy weeds about me twist."¹⁶ Since this is the epilogue of the final version of the story, it would seem that Melville wished to end on a realistic note to correct any possible misinterpretation of his irony in the hanging scene.

The story of Billy Budd was Melville's final answer to the critics who contended that Ahab and Pierre invited their own fate and that Melville had not made a compelling case for his pessimistic view of the universe. In *Billy Budd* Melville demonstrated that even the most innocent are doomed in a world in which, as Schopenhauer said, "We are like lambs in a field, disporting themselves under the eye of the butcher, who chooses out first one and then another for his prey."¹⁷

HARRY MODEAN CAMPBELL

University of Mississippi

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 278.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 279.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 280.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 281.

¹⁶ *Idem.*

¹⁷ *Essays of Arthur Schopenhauer*, selected and translated by T. Bailey Saunders (New York, n.d.), p. 382. It was Saunders' translation of the complete works of Schopenhauer which Melville, in the last years of his life, read carefully, and in which he underlined or marked many passages, including some in Saunders' prefaces. See Freeman's introduction to *Melville's Billy Budd*, *passim*.

SYMBOLISM IN *A CONNECTICUT YANKEE IN KING
ARTHUR'S COURT*

"How Sir Launcelot Slew Two Giants, and Made a Castle Free" is the tale in Malory's *Morte D'Arthur* read by the author of *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court* as a nightcap, which introduces the reader to Mark Twain's satire. Although previous students have apparently not been concerned with the reason for the selection of this episode, I find it especially significant that Twain chose Launcelot's encounter with the two giants¹ to open his tale.

It seems to me that this opening scene is not mere "padding" as it is called by Professor John Hoben in an article in *American Literature*. It is true, as Professor Hoben states, that "attention is not engaged until the stranger begins his curious story."² Certainly Twain was aware of this. But in the Boss's confession, near the end, of the two schemes he had in his head—the vastest of all his projects³—I believe that we find the clew to Twain's use of the opening Malory episode.

Is it too much to read in the two giants, "well armed, all save their heads, and with two horrible clubs in their hands,"⁴ the two mighty powers, the Catholic Church and monarchy, which the Boss hoped to overthrow? Is not Sir Launcelot really Mark Twain wielding his sword against the institutions of the Established Church and king? Just as Sir Launcelot is waging battles dressed in Sir Kay's armor, so Twain is waging his battles in the garb of the Boss, who says: "... I would be the death of slavery, that I was resolved upon..."⁵

Both giants are "well armed," and thus we see the "heavy hand of the Church and the king"⁶ holding the clubs symbolizing the vast power attained by them. The club held by Monarchy is the power of life and death over those not of noble birth. The Church's

¹ Mark Twain, *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1917), p. 3.

² John B. Hoben, "Mark Twain's *A Connecticut Yankee*: a Genetic Study," *American Literature*, XVIII (1946), p. 217.

³ Twain, *op. cit.*, p. 399.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 189.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 285.

club is the ban, or the "Curse of Rome."⁷ In a larger sense it is the Interdict; and it is a club, for when the Boss returns to England to find "the mournfulness of death" everywhere, he says: "The Church had struck. . . ."⁸ Probably Launcelot was not afraid of the two giants, but Sir Kay would have been, as was the Boss, especially of the Church. In his confession of fear,⁹ is not the "death to human liberty and paralysis to human thought" the effect of the blow of a club? Nor does the Church deny that it holds the power to "hurt whom it may," as witness the statement of the Father Superior of the monastery of the Valley of Holiness.¹⁰

Throughout the *Yankee*, the Church, I believe, is subject to a more concentrated attack, making the symbolism easier to trace. At least three times Twain speaks of the hand of the giant.¹¹ That he has given it the attributes of a powerful person is also evidenced throughout.¹² Then, of this person's upbringing, to make of it a political machine, he says: ". . . it is nursed, cradled, preserved for that; it is an enemy to human liberty, and does no good which it could not better do in a split-up and scattered condition."¹³ This splitting process Launcelot applied, in the opening episode, to the two giants whom he encountered, killing one by claving his head asunder, and the other by claving him to the middle.

Both giants, we have noted, are "well armed, all save the heads." In fact, Twain says of the King ". . . he wasn't a very heavy weight, intellectually."¹⁴ And the Boss considers neither the Church nor Monarchy well armed in their heads, for they are both so easily duped by Merlin. Both the Church and Monarchy are gullible, as are their subjects, "legitimatest possible children of Monarchy by the Grace of God and the Established Church. . . ."¹⁵ It is also noteworthy that the giants are together when Launcelot meets them, for throughout the *Yankee* they are often attacked in their interrelationship.

The probability of Twain's use of a pervading symbol properly recognizes a focus in the novel. Though such recognition does not insist on absolute consistency or complete extension of the symbol,

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 287.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 411.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 196.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 64, 282, 427.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 79, 104, 423.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 277.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 161.

I think we may go so far as to ask: what is this weapon which Launcelot Twain wields throughout the *Yankee*? The Boss says that he "had no scruples, but was willing to assail it [the Church] in any way or with any weapon that promised to hurt it."¹⁶ The clew to his "sword" is to be found, I think, in a rather lengthy quotation from an unpublished article, Item 102 in Paine's checklist of the Mark Twain Papers, as quoted by Professor Hoben. The date of this item, says Professor Hoben, is uncertain, coming probably between April, 1888, and January, 1892; the essential, however, is that we have an expression of Twain's sentiments, and perhaps a clew to the symbolism he used throughout.

Its (the American press') frank and cheerful irreverence is by all odds the most valuable quality it possesses. For its mission—overlooked by Mr. Arnold—is to stand guard over a nation's liberties, not its humbugs and shams. And so it must be armed with ridicule, not reverence. If during fifty years you could impose the blight of English journalism's solemnity and timid respect for shams upon the press, it is within the possibilities that the republic would perish; and if during fifty years you could expose the stately and mossgrown shams of Europe to the fire of a flouting and scoffing press like ours, it is almost a moral certainty that monarchy and its attendant crimes would disappear from Christendom. . . .

Let us sincerely hope that this will remain a fact forever: for to my mind a discriminating irreverence is the creator and protector of human liberty—even as the other thing is the creator and protector of all forms of human slavery, bodily and mental. . . .¹⁷

Is not Launcelot Twain's sword named *Irreverence*, then—"the protector of human liberty"? "English journalism's solemnity" would be symbolized by Sir Sagramor. Merlin, as I have indicated above, represents the humbugs and shams. The Boss is the flouting and scoffing American press, who, when he challenges the chivalry of all England in the tournament, is exposing the stately and mossgrown shams of Europe (as symbolized by the knights) to the fire of his weapon, so that monarchy and its attendant crimes will disappear from Christendom.

Launcelot, in the opening Malory episode, killed his two giants, but the ending of the *Yankee* is inconclusive. When Mark Twain acknowledges this in his preface,¹⁸ do we not then have Launcelot

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

¹⁷ John B. Hoben, "Mark Twain's *A Connecticut Yankee*: a Genetic Study," *American Literature*, xviii (1946), p. 200.

¹⁸ Twain, *op. cit.*, p. ix.

Twain recognizing his weakness and his need for further training in the use of his sword *Irreverence*?

In an article by Professor Robert H. Wilson on "Malory in the Connecticut Yankee," in which the author makes a study of the authenticity of the Malory material used by Twain, he says, after giving many specific references:

If one sums up these ways in which the *Yankee* makes use of *Morte Darthur*, he will find the total considerable, yet somewhat less than might have been expected from a general impression of the novel, or from biographical conclusions of Twain's close familiarity with Malory.¹⁰

Yet, he continues, Twain used his source "intensively and cleverly." I believe that Mark Twain used his source far more intensively and cleverly than we have realized.

JULIETTE A. TRAINOR

State Teachers College at Paterson, New Jersey

YEATS ON THE POET LAUREATESHIP

An early, unsigned letter by W. B. Yeats on the subject of the poet laureateship has escaped the notice of his biographers and bibliographers. When Tennyson died on October 6, 1892, the editors of the London *Bookman* wrote to "four distinguished poets" to inquire whether the laureateship should be continued and if so on whom it should be conferred. The poets' answers appeared in the *Bookman*, November, 1892, under the title, "The Question of the Laureateship."¹ The only signed letter of the four bears the initials of Robert Bridges. That Yeats was one of the contributors is made certain in a holograph letter to John O'Leary written from Sligo in November, 1892. Yeats told O'Leary that the second of the four letters on the laureateship in the current *Bookman* was his, and added that he was reviewing Tennyson's *Death of Oenone* for the next issue.² Yeats's discussion of the laureateship, by far the

¹⁰ Robert H. Wilson, "Malory in the *Connecticut Yankee*," *University of Texas Studies in English*, XXVII (1948), p. 195.

¹ III, 52-55.

² Yeats's letter to O'Leary is in the Henry W. and Albert A. Berg Collection, New York Public Library. The review of *The Death of Oenone* appeared in the *Bookman* in December, 1892.

most pungent of the group in which it appeared, gives evidence of his genuine concern for the independence of the poet from politics and for the dignity of poetry.

In the opening of his letter to the *Bookman* Yeats commented on the fact that the only men with a right to the position of poet laureate would be the last to receive the offer of it and the last to accept such an offer if made. "Mr. Swinburne," he wrote, "has hardly so entirely thrust underground his old convictions, or so utterly forgotten his lines about 'a linnet chirping on the wrist of kings'³ to take an office directly from the Court; nor would Mr. William Morris be ready to exchange lectures at Kelmscott House for songs about royal marriages, no matter how large a hogshead of sherry were made over to him in the bargain." Since the conditions of the laureateship made it "impossible to the only two men fitted for it alike by genius and the acclaim of the best public of their day," Yeats urged mending the conditions. If they were not mended, Tennyson, "the supreme artist" who was gone, would be succeeded by "some unreadable mediocrity or fluent monger of platitudes, his throat still hoarse from self-advertisement." The central passage of Yeats's argument for nationalizing the laureateship follows:

All the public officers, from the Prime Minister downwards, were once Court officials, but now they are responsible to the nation and to the nation alone. Surely it is time to transform the Laureateship also, and to expect no Laureate in return for his pension and his sherry to do other than celebrate, if he be so minded, for the muses make but indifferent drudges, matters of national importance, great battles if he hold them to be waged in a just cause, the deaths of famous men of thought and action, and the ever-coming never-come light of that ideal peace and freedom whereto all nations are stumbling in the darkness. In the old days the imagination of the world would have fared but ill without its kings and nobles, for in those times, when few could read and pictures were many a mile between, they kept before men's minds a more refined and ample ideal of life than was possible to the small chief in his rush-strewn tower or to the carle in his poor cottage. . . . But now no man can say that life displays itself under the best conditions in royalties and nobilities, for refinement and ample life

³ The passage referred to is from "Mater Triumphalis," *Songs before Sunrise*, and reads: "I keep no time of song with gold-perched singers / And chirp of linnets on the wrists of kings." Swinburne referred no doubt to Colley Cibber's ignominious self-portrait, as reported by Johnson and recorded by Boswell: "Perch'd on the eagle's soaring wing, / The lowly linnet loves to sing."

have gone out into the highways and byways, and the Laureate should go after them, and be their master of the revels.

Even Tennyson, Yeats held, belittled his own work in fulfilling royal expectations of the poet laureate:

Surely most of us, whatever be our politics, feel that "The Idylls of the King" are marred a little by the dedications to the Prince Consort and to the Queen, and not necessarily because either was unworthy of exceeding praise, but because neither represents to us a fuller and more beautiful kind of life than is possible to any mere subject, and because the attempt to make them do so, even though so mighty a poet made it, has a little lessened the significance of the great imaginative types of Arthur and Guinevere, and cast round the greatest romantic poem of the century a ring of absurdity. . . . Were not this alone sufficient reason, even if all others were lacking, for nationalizing the laureateship?

If the laureateship were nationalized in this sense and "in some conspicuous fashion," Yeats believed either Morris or Swinburne would accept it, and make a worthy successor to Wordsworth and Tennyson. Yeats himself preferred Morris, "the worthier of the two, perhaps, for he is still producing work scarce a whit less moving than were the songs and stories of his youth, while Mr. Swinburne has been these many days, if we consider his verse alone, too careful of the sound, too careless of the sense."

In conclusion Yeats justified the discursiveness of his letter because he was "suggesting something which has not the slightest chance of being done"; and besides, if he had not talked somewhat of things in general, he should have had to discuss "the claims of all kinds of perfectly absurd people, and even to take seriously him of whom it has been said that he calls himself 'of Penbryn,' to be distinguished from his namesake of Parnassus."⁴ One other poet contributing to the symposium did discuss seriously the claims of Lewis Morris and Alfred Austin, though his first choice was Swinburne. Bridges (if "R. B." was Bridges), loftily indifferent to the entire matter of the laureateship, preferred Swinburne, if an appointment were to be made, with Morris as a poor second choice. The fourth contributor suggested allowing the universities to denominate more than one poet as *laureate* and thus to dispose of court favoritism. A long debate followed the poets' recommenda-

⁴ Lewis Morris (1833-1907), afterwards Sir Lewis Morris, was born at Penbryn, Wales.

tions on the laureateship, and, as Yeats had prophesied, an insistent mediocrity and mouther of platitudes was ultimately appointed to the office dignified by Wordsworth and Tennyson. In 1896 Alfred Austin became poet laureate of England.

A suggestive footnote to Yeats's early statement on the laureateship came forty-five years later. When Edward VIII gave up his throne for a woman, Yeats romantically approved the king's decision in *A Marriage Ode*, a song later entitled *A Model for the Laureate*. The last stanza is characteristic of the whole in its scorn of crowns, thrones, nationalism. No poet can be concerned with them, no decent man weigh them against love.

The Muse is mute when public men
Applaud a modern throne:
Those cheers that can be bought or sold,
That office fools have run,
That waxen seal, that signature.
For things like these what decent man
Would keep his lover waiting?
Keep his lover waiting? ⁵

In a letter to Lady Gerald Wellesley, Yeats said of this poem, "It is the kind of thing I would have written had I been made Laureate, which is perhaps why I was not made Laureate." ⁶ This humorous detachment when Yeats was seventy-two contrasts vigorously with the seriousness with which, as a young man of twenty-seven, he recognized that, in spite of the hopes of the nineteenth century, neither Wordsworth nor Tennyson had made the laureateship safe for a poet's dignity or his artistic integrity.

MARION WITT

Hunter College

COOPER'S SEA NOVELS SPURNED IN THE MAINTOP

For modern readers it may seem like laboring the obvious to point out that we are unable to enter imaginatively into Cooper's world of fiction because his characters are for the most part not

⁵ *Last Poems and Plays* (New York, 1940), p. 44.

⁶ *Letters on Poetry to Dorothy Wellesley* (New York, 1940), July 26, 1937.

credible in speech, action, and motivation. Yet a tradition has persisted almost down to the present day about the "authenticity" of his sea novels, applied specifically to the maritime scenes and maneuvers of ships but extended also to his fictional sailors, with top honors divided between *The Pilot* (1823) and *The Red Rover* (1828). A century after he launched this genre John Erskine declared: "The nautical realism of *The Pilot* has been practically unquestioned."¹

Cooper's first biographer set the pattern for this traditional estimate by two anecdotes. One was of the novelist's argument, from "his own intimate familiarity with ocean-life," that *The Pirate* (by Scott) was clearly the work of a landsman and that he as a sailor could write a better. The other was of his testing his own *Pilot* by reading the account of a ship in a gale to his old messmate, Commander William Shubrick, whose voucher for its accuracy is proved by his excited pacing till the climax when he levelled a minute criticism: "It's all very well, but you let your jib stand too long, my fine fellow!" Lounsbury accepts these stories as proving the book's "vividness and reality." To which he adds praise of Cooper's use of technical terms, as enough to satisfy professional seamen without disturbing landsmen, and cites approvingly Sir Walter Scott's opinion that his delineation of naval characters was unexcelled.² This was echoed as the received opinion in literary histories and biographies for the next half century, culminating in Boynton's eulogy:

The *Pilot* was the first authentic sea tale ever written and it is still one of the best. All sea fiction till then had been written by landsmen and for landsmen. Cooper chose to write so that sea-dogs might find satisfaction in his pictures and his manoeuvres. He used the right nautical terms and let the landlubbers guess what they meant.³

Contemporary reviewers overwhelmingly shared this opinion of Cooper's fidelity to naval life, with considerable explicit praise (and no overt criticism) of the realism of his sailor characterizations

¹ *Leading American Novelists* (New York, 1910), p. 73.

² T. R. Lounsbury, *James Fenimore Cooper* (Boston, 1882), pp. 44-48, 57.

³ H. W. Boynton, *James Fenimore Cooper* (New York, 1931), p. 125. For similar estimates see Carl Van Doren in *CHAL* (1917), I, 297; and Stanley T. Williams in *LHUS* (1948), I, 261-262.

and dialogue.⁴ And though a few feared that his elaborate use of technical terms and "the peculiar jargon of seaman" might restrict his reading public, the large sales of *The Pilot* and *The Red Rover* suggest that landsmen did not find him unintelligible. In the face of this it is surprising to discover a very different reaction from an audience of ordinary seamen on board the frigate *United States* during a cruise in 1823-1828. Nathaniel Ames, an educated blue-jacket who had been at sea more than a dozen years, tells how Cooper's sea tales were rejected by his salt water contemporaries:

Landsmen generally have very mistaken notions concerning sailors, and most of these notions are absurd and ridiculous. Cooper's novels, the *Pilot* and the *Red Rover*, they think afford a correct picture of sea life and manners, and compare him to the author of *Waverly*. 'Credat Judaeus Appella, non ego,' (which is ladies being interpreted, 'tell that to the marines,') to say nothing of the silly and contemptible hatred of the English nation, which breaks out in every sentence, and which no gentleman in the American navy ever did, or ever will cherish, his sea dialogues are disgusting and absurd, from being stuffed with sea phrases.

Sailors do not (except when describing some nautical transaction) converse in technical terms, any more than lawyers or physicians, and not near so much as clergymen of certain sects, nor do they swear so much, or at least not more than landsmen, though there is more energy and *pathos* in a sailor's oaths than in the stiff and labored imprecations of a mere 'terrae filius.' 'Tom Coffin' is a caricature (and not a very good one) of an 'old salt,' but terribly strained and stiff.

I recollect once being desired by a dozen or twenty of my top-mates, to read a few passages of the *Pilot*. Every thing seemed to please them well enough, till I came to one of the *rope-yarn* dialogues, when 'Pshaw! heave the d—d thing overboard,' broke out from the lips of half a dozen men of war's men at once. They appeared to think that such ridiculous language 'did discredit to our mystery.'

The *Red Rover* is much admired too, by landsmen and I verily believe it is because they do not understand two words of it. These gratuitous admirers are chiefly exquisites and boarding school girls, who do not know salt water from fresh, or at least which end of a ship goes foremost, and who think that a sailor is a distinct animal, unlike the rest of the human family, like the Vermont lady, who, when a sailor (the first one she ever saw) was pointed out to her, exclaimed with some disappointment, 'Why law you, he has not got the *least bit of a tail*.' The character of 'Fid' in particular, is most supremely ridiculous. A waister who had not been

⁴ See the broad survey of American, English, and French criticism in Marcel Clavel, *Fenimore Cooper and his Critics* (Aix-en-Provence, 1938), pp. 183-263.

a *banyan day* on board a guard ship, would be ashamed to use such silly language as *Fid overflows with*.⁵

It is interesting how closely this tirade by a contemporary sea-dog parallels the reaction of Cooper's most recent biographer. The first to comment adversely on his over use of sailor's jargon ("the deliberate and uncompromising unintelligibility of its details for the average reader"), he points out the error of this as a method for securing *vraisemblance* in fiction. Citing Cooper's belligerent preface telling reviewers that as landlubbers they would be too ignorant to criticize his novel, Grossman adds: "Criticism has submitted meekly ever since to this bullying, assuring readers of the excellence of Cooper's technical knowledge and at the same time disclaiming the ability to judge it."⁶ So in the daily life of the ship "Cooper delighted in confounding the ignorant with the mystification of jargon." And his characters are unconvincing for similar reasons; even Tom Coffin, long admired as one of his most original creations, is described as "too much the product of mechanical extravagance presented more as a marine animal . . . than as a man." Cooper only slowly came around to the discovery that "the true subject for a sea story is not the sea or even a ship but a ship's company."

Nathaniel Ames's anecdote is also valuable for the light it throws on the history of literary taste, indicating that the prevailing fashion in which Cooper wrote and which gained him wide popularity with the novel-reading public of his day was not shared by the non-literary common man. And it may shed some light on Ames too, whose criticism is possibly colored by professional jealousy, for he was likewise a sailor-author, lagging pretty far behind in the race for fame.

CHARLES ANDERSON

The Johns Hopkins University

⁵ Nathaniel Ames, *A Mariner's Sketches* (Providence, 1830), pp. 238-239.

⁶ James Grossman, *James Fenimore Cooper* (New York, 1949), p. 37. The next three quotations are from pp. 37 and 38.

THE FIRST PERSON IN "CALIBAN UPON SETEBOS"

Interpreters of "Caliban upon Setebos; or, Natural Theology in the Island" usually mention the curious third personal speech of Caliban, and usually ignore the passages where he speaks in the first person.¹ W. L. Phelps did not ignore these, but his comment is unhelpful, "Caliban speaks in the third person (did Browning make a slip when he changes occasionally to the first?) in order to have indicated the low order of his intelligence."² Caliban shifts to the first person singular six times; over a hundred lines in a poem just short of three hundred are in the first person singular or governed by others that are;³ and another twenty-five are in the first person plural.⁴ Both the number of first personal lines and the frequency of the shifting to them tell against an interpretation that the first person intrudes only by a slip.

The probable reason for the failure of interpreters to perceive or to mention the first personal passages is the difficulty in accounting for them in ways that are consistent with the usual explanations for the use of the third person. Mrs. Orr says of Caliban that "he speaks as children do in the third person"; her view, held by many others, is elaborated by F. M. Sim who says that he "soliloquizes in the third person—the elementary infantine before it knows itself as 'I.'"⁵ Paul de Reul, among others, relates Caliban's third personal speech not to that of children but to that of primitive peoples—"il parle de lui-même à la troisième personne comme un

¹ Mrs. Sutherland Orr, *Handbook to the Works of Robert Browning*, 7th ed. (London, 1896), 195; Charlotte Porter and Helen A. Clarke, eds., *Men and Women, In A Balcony, Dramatis Personae* (N. Y., 1898), 313; E. M. Naish, *Browning and Dogma* (London, 1906), 16; S. S. Curry, *Browning and the Dramatic Monologue* (Boston, n.d.), 24, "He does not use the pronoun 'I' or the possessive 'my.'"

² W. L. Phelps, *Robert Browning* (Indianapolis, 1915), 328. See also C. G. Ames, "Caliban upon Setebos" in *Boston Browning Society Papers* (N. Y., 1897), 69.

³ The first person singular passages begin at ll. 68, 126, 160, 175, 202, 269.

⁴ The first person plural passages begin at ll. 56, 242, 253. They prepare the way for passages in the first person singular.

⁵ Orr, *loc. cit.*; F. M. Sim, *Robert Browning, Poet and Philosopher* (London, 1923), 116.

vrai sauvage."⁶ To explain the shift to the first person and be faithful to either of these interpretations one would require to establish that the first personal passages show Caliban moving to a more mature or a more civilized state of mind. Although it is possible to do so for some of the first personal passages, in which Caliban draws complicated analogies, or spins elaborate speculations, I do not think that in general the first and the third personal passages can be separated in terms of complication.

There is another way of regarding the use of the third person, adopted by E. M. Naish: "Even in summer he deems it desirable to avoid a too openly offered challenge to Setebos; hence the employment throughout his soliloquy of the third person singular in a curious attempt to mislead his hearer."⁷ Although the "throughout" is grossly mistaken, the clue is valuable. It is in keeping with the vigorous close of the poem, its most dramatic passage, where, amid the thunder and lighting, Caliban disowns all he has said as "fool's-play, this prattling," and in the third person promises amends.

The passages in the first person can be accounted for as expressions of those elements in Caliban's character that are struggling against his fear of Setebos, and the shifts from one person to another then serve to show the heightening of tension within the speaker. Caliban moves into the first person plural at l. 56 in an outburst of impudent resentment, "Made all we see and us in spite: how else?" He then glides into the first person singular at l. 68, citing himself as an analogue to Setebos in modes of dealing with those who are at the mercy of a superior being. In this first use of the first person singular, which is extended, he is talking about what excites him intensely: the pleasure of intoxication and then the pleasure of arbitrary power with its opportunity for cruelty. He feels he is a god, and talks like one. He shifts back to the third person singular at ll. 98-99 to make a dangerous generalization about Setebos, using the "Thinketh" form that is usual with him in such moments. He then prolongs his account, in the first person singular, of the pleasure he feels in the exercise of arbitrary power.

His second venture into the first person is comparable with his first. In the previous venture he tried out the first person plural before risking the first person singular. Now at l. 123 he imagines

⁶ P. de Reul, *L'art et la pensée de Robert Browning* (Brussels, 1926), 165.

⁷ Naish, *loc. cit.*

one of his victims addressing him in the first person singular, and retorts in the same: "Would not I smash it with my foot: so He." He keeps to the first person singular until he mentions, for the first time, the power over Setebos, the Quiet, and at this moment, a delicate one if Setebos should be attending, he reverts to the third person.

Especially skillful and striking is his next venture into the first person singular: he is talking of the creature who serves him as a surrogate for Miranda:

A four legged serpent he makes cower and crouch,
Now snarl, now hold its breath and mind his eye,
And saith she is Miranda, and my wife.

To dismiss this sudden shift as a slip is to miss one of the most vigorous characterizing touches in the poem. The fourth shift is similar to this: again a construction has been begun in the third person, and again Caliban becomes incautious because he is talking about something that he very intimately cares about, physical happiness:

Why not make horny eyes no thorn could prick
Or plate my scalp with bone against the snow,
Or overscale my flesh 'neath joint and joint.

The fifth shift is an impudence like the first, but now without a prelude since Caliban, with repeated immunity from punishment, and growing excitement over his wrongs, is now much bolder than when he began to speak. He rages (ll. 202-238) at the injustice of Setebos in favoring Prospero at his expense. This is a beautifully subtle passage. Caliban moves over into the second person plural at l. 224; and then to the greater security of the third person singular in the two following lines. He has gone beyond what it is at all safe to say. Yet so vehement is his rage that he returns to the first person singular at ll. 225-228, and at 231-232, modulating back to the third person singular in the imagined utterance of one of his victims in ll. 236-238.

The final passage in the first person singular is, as it should be for both dramatic and psychological reasons, the boldest of all (ll. 269-283). Caliban appreciates that Setebos may surprise him while he is saying these intolerably defiant and impudent words, and explains what he would do to appease the god. He would propitiate by rite, abstinence, and self-torture, always hoping, however, that

Setebos would one day succumb to the superior force of the Quiet, or else become stupidly indifferent to what men do or say.

On the heels of this passage comes the dramatic close in which Caliban abounds in third personal speech, and more often than in any other part of the poem, except the opening, avoids or suppresses even the third personal pronouns. Setebos, he is sure, has overheard him, and Caliban does what he said he would do,^s except that he does not risk singing his primitive song, in which the first personal pronouns fell so thick.

The shifts to the first person and back to the third enrich the characterization and heighten the drama. To take them as deliberate need not mean that one denies the intention or the effectiveness of the poem as a rendering of savage or immature character. What it means is that one attends also to the intention or at least the effectiveness of the poem as a rendering of a character in which there is a sharp conflict (between fear and guile on the one hand and impudence and self-love on the other) and as a rendering of a drama in which there is a slow rise towards thinking oneself as great as one's god and a sudden fall to grovelling as a slave before that god. I should like to add that there is a refinement in the use for deceiving a god of so obvious a device as shifting from speech in one person to speech in another; but the failure of so many to perceive the device makes one forbear.

E. K. BROWN *

University of Chicago

LANIER AND SCIENCE: ADDENDA

Like many other poets in the late nineteenth century, Lanier was drawn into the controversy between science and religion, excited by the widening of the boundaries of the mind but disturbed by the doubts that were unsettling old beliefs. A detailed account of its

*It is worth noting that in each article he does a little less than he has promised, a deceiver to the end. Instead of letting his apples rot on the tree, he will abstain from eating whelks, instead of burning as an offering the best of his yearling kids, and giving his favorite beast to the orc, he will let the quails escape him, instead of cutting off a finger he bites through his lip.

* We regret deeply that Mr. Brown died early this month.—THE EDITORS.

impact on his poetry and prose, hastening the development of his unorthodoxy and opening the way to a new diction and technique, has already been published by the present writer in *The Centennial Edition of the Works of Sidney Lanier* (Baltimore, 1945).¹ This must now be supplemented by a few fragments in Lanier's handwriting on the same subject that turned up too late for inclusion. The evidence is clear that they were written in the last years of his life, 1877-1881:²

[a] is written on a half sheet of the same paper used by Lanier for a series of lectures delivered at Johns Hopkins in the winter of 1881; the last sentence, indeed, is echoed in the second and third lectures (iv, 38, 42). [b] has a notation, verso, "435 N. Calvert St.," the Baltimore address to which Lanier moved in September, 1879. [c] is written on the cancelled title-page of "The Death of Byrhtnoth," an essay he composed in the spring or summer of 1879. [d] is written on the back of an envelope postmarked "Rec'd Baltimore Md. June 13"; the only years Lanier was resident in Baltimore in June were 1877-1880.

In theme these fragments are supplementary to the "Poem Outlines" grouped under the sub-heading of "Credo, and Other Poems" (I, 262-275).

[a] Science does not diminish the number of our religious mysteries by explaining things: for, every explanation which science gives us brings us to a point where a thousand new mysteries reveal themselves. It is always true that the more we know, the more we know that we *don't* know. Sir Wm. Hamilton's knowledge is the consummation of ignorance. Ex tumboio epi tumboio [sic]: from mystery of birth to mystery of death: so we fare.

What we call explanation is at bottom only a reference of mysteries with which we are unfamiliar to mysteries with which we are familiar.

[b] Nature stands with her arms open to those who find life little worth, and art exhaustible. How little do we know of the facts of physical things, yet? To observe these and record them faithfully is a work which every person with eyes can do; and here is an occupation for everyone which forever grows more and more fascinating. There are some matters whose importance is such that ignorance in respect of them wrecks more happi-

¹ See especially the Introduction to the volume of *Poems*, I, lxvi-lxxxi, and the Index to volume X under appropriate headings. All references to volume and page throughout these notes are to the Centennial Edition.

² The packet, containing more than a score of MS jottings, is in the Tilley Collection, Johns Hopkins University Library. Most of them repeat or overlap similar fragments of ideas for his lectures, notes on his readings, and outlines for poems already published in the Centennial Edition, in a section of "Poem Outlines" appended to the volume of *Poems*. And since that group was frankly selective, I have culled only the most interesting for inclusion here.

ness than all wars and crimes and follies: matters between husband and wife, between father and child—yet how few know of them at all and how little does the most learned know of them!

[c] The sentimental clergyman, looking out of his study window in the morning, delights in the grass, the trees, the birds, and lifting up his hands calls upon the people to behold the beautiful glories of the God of Love. But let us look down at the roots of this grass and these trees, lo, they are desperately pushing and fighting each other for existence, look in upon the crop of this bird, who is singing so melodiously, and behold a worm, yet writhing. Is this love?—which has ordained that beneath every square yard of all this green beauty and freshness goes on all day the monstrous tragedy of the struggle for existence? Why didst thou not ordain, O Love, that we could eat for our hunger the south wind and drink the starlight for our thirst, and all should have plenty, and none should be obliged to get his own life by taking away the life of another?

The Hebrew fable recognizes most naively the monstrosity of this arrangement by the stupendous fable invented to account for it.

[d] A man who lives seventy years will have had ten bodies: vision of these ten at the Last Day: which will the soul enter? Probably at this Last Day the whole corpus of the earth will be needed for the bodies of the resurrected: so that the earth will disappear in this natural way, being entirely taken up in the bodies of the living beings.

These four new "Poem Outlines" have little intrinsic significance; Lanier was not important for what he thought, but what he felt. Instead, they are suggestive of the direction of his thinking and show him trying to translate it into material for his poetry. (The last one offers an interesting comparison with a late poem by Whitman, "This Compost.") And the fortunate survival of a number of prose drafts of ideas that were actually worked out into finished poems indicates just how meaningful to the poet were jottings that show small promise to the reader.³

As a sequel to this note it seems necessary now to point out the inadequacy of F. W. Conner's chapter on Lanier in his recent *Cosmic Optimism: A Study of the Interpretation of Evolution by American Poets from Emerson to Robinson*,⁴ the only extended treatment of the impact of science on nineteenth-century American poetry yet published. Failing to make use of the Centennial Edition, issued three or four years earlier, he missed a large part of the most interesting evidence—the previously unpublished out-

³ See, for example, I, 317, 321, 360, 361, 364.

⁴ (Gainesville, Fla., 1949), pp. 191-210, "Taylor and Lanier: The Romantic Evolutionism Again."

lines, fragments, letters, and marginalia in scientific volumes written by Lanier in his last years. (He even overlooked the selection of *Poem Outlines* printed in 1908.) In these private notes Lanier was far more outspoken than in the poetry and prose he submitted for publication. Because of his intellectual isolation he thought he was more of a radical than was actually the case, and because two of his poems had been rejected for their unorthodoxy⁵ he was afraid of hurting the religious faith of others. Further, the real influence of science on his thinking and his art came in later life when creative activity was slowed down by illness and his desperate attempts to earn a living with lectures and pot-boilers. And though he did not live long enough to assimilate these new ideas into books, they survive in jottings. Hence Conner's account, without being a misinterpretation, places undue emphasis on Lanier's earlier sentimental evasion, his romantic theory that history shows a process of etherealization in nature and man.⁶ And it minimizes the honest struggle in his last years to face the consequences of his doubts and resolve the discordant note of science in his "theory of oppositions." At his death he was working towards a stronger and more sombre music than the confident songs produced by the cosmic optimism of his middle period.

CHARLES ANDERSON

The Johns Hopkins University

A NOTE ON E. A. ROBINSON'S "CREDO"

Several obscurities in the poetry of E. A. Robinson are caused by simple failures in craftsmanship; with a style so indirect, an approach so cautious and tentative, a minor flaw in syntax or organization can understandably occasion inordinate difficulty. Many of these obscurities can, however, be cleared up by reference to information outside the poems.

⁵ "Remonstrance" in 1878 and "The Cloud" in 1880 (see I, lxvii).

⁶ A flavor of this is carried over, it is true, into his lectures on "The English Novel" in 1881 (see IV, 25-40); but these were *public* lectures, in which his enthusiastic response to Whitman was likewise played down because of his audience.

In the case of a poem like "Credo" (1896), one that is obviously central to the thought of Robinson's early work, it is essential that this be done. And exegesis of the transition in thought that occurs in the sestet, which is the major cause of difficulty, is of particular pertinence, for in this transition is the crux of Robinson's philosophy.

The octave is sufficiently lucid: after a flat statement of despair, Robinson turns to a series of qualifying declarations which establish, through a set of linked images, the precise extent of his faith and its reliability. The passage, incidentally, is a magnificent example of how the movement of a rhetorical pattern and the structure contributed by the syntax can provide supplementary meaning to the expression of the more general idea. In this case, the concatenation of images and the gradual extension of grammatical complexity stand almost in relation of symbol to the expression of the tenuousness of the poet's hopes:

I cannot find my way: there is no star
In all the shrouded heavens anywhere;
And there is not a whisper in the air
Of any living voice but one so far
That I can hear it only as a bar
Of lost, imperial music, played when fair
And angel fingers wove, and unaware,
Dead leaves to garlands where no roses are.¹

In the sestet, however, the thought is difficult to grasp, though the conclusions are clear:

No, there is not a glimmer, nor a call,
For one that welcomes, welcomes when he fears,
The black and awful chaos of the night;
For through it all—above, beyond it all—
I know the far-sent message of the years,
I feel the coming glory of the Light.

The connective "for" is obviously the crucial word here; at first, it seems merely puzzling, and one must turn to other sources

¹ *Collected Poems* (New York: Macmillan, 1937), p. 94. In 1894, Robinson had written his friend Arthur Gledhill: "The future looks dark and a little too rough to suit me, but sometimes I think I catch a little glimmer of light—though it is so far away that I am not sure of it." (Unpublished letter of September 29, 1894, quoted by permission of the Harvard College Library).

IF this is Read in days to come
let it be known to young and old
The legend of which you ARE told
of Bruce (Negro) the host of the Brave
and Bold. shall one day come.

to clarify the problem. Robinson's "transcendental optimism" (the phrase was his own) was always dependent upon a sturdy confrontation of tragedy and evil; he phrased this aspect of his philosophy in a number of ways, but never more cogently than when he wrote to Josephine Peabody: "I still stick to my thesis that the world is a Hell of a Place, and that it should be one if it means anything."²

With this basic idea in mind, one can return to the poem and understand why the poet "welcomes when he fears, the black and awful chaos of the night." The night is proof of the coming of the light, though it is fearful in itself. "For," then, introduces a final modification and explanation of "welcomes when he fears." in terms of an expansion of the earlier star imagery. The interposition of "the black and awful chaos of the night" throws the reader off balance, and renders it unlikely that he can follow Robinson's agile turnings. One can hardly say that Robinson has successfully established his full meaning within the form; though the thought is not particularly difficult, the essential paradox is not firmly grounded and the syntactical organization, which might have made this crucial point clear, contributes rather to its obfuscation.

EDWIN S. FUSSELL

University of California (Berkeley)

THE ORIGIN OF J. ALFRED PRUFROCK

The name of J. Alfred Prufrock, T. S. Eliot's man of divided conscience, was probably suggested by the Prufrock-Littau Company, furniture dealers located at Fourth and St. Charles Streets in St. Louis, Eliot's birthplace, at the time of the composition and publication of "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock" in 1915. A store advertisement was printed in the December 19, 1912, issue of *Reedy's Mirror*, an important literary weekly of the 1900-1920 period.

The name Prufrock is so rare that a thorough search of the telephone directories of fifteen other large American cities failed to

² Unpublished letter of March 12, 1915, quoted by permission of the Harvard College Library.

discover a single representative of the family. In St. Louis, however, three were listed in the 1950 directory: Mrs. C. Prufrock, Mrs. Harry Prufrock, and W. F. Prufrock, Jr.

A letter of inquiry in regard to J. Alfred Prufrock's origin was sent to Mr. Eliot and elicited the following reply: "Several correspondents have recently called my attention to the Prufrock-Littau Company, furniture dealers of St. Louis. I did not have, at the time of writing the poem, and have not yet recovered, any recollection of having acquired the name in this way, but I think that it must be assumed that I did, and that the memory has been obliterated."

STEPHEN STEPANCHEV

Queens College

REVIEWS

Goethe das Leben im Werk, von HEINRICH MEYER, Hamburg-Bergedorf, Strom-Verlag, 1949. Pp. 677.

Meyer disliked the picture of a "serene Apollinian" Goethe which he claims the biographers—"Goethe-Dichter" he calls them—have "invented." So he sat down and read the "150,000 printed pages of original Goethe writings and sources" together with "some unpublished material." Having penetrated the "subtle psychological processes of poetic writing" he set about to write 670 odd pages of his own "Goethe-Dichtung." He draws the picture of a man whose most prominent feature is a will to domineer—"humorloser Herrscher, der sich überaus ernst nimmt"—"herrisch oberflächlich"—"eifersüchtig und herrschsüchtig und habgierig." The wisdom of such a character is questionable because he lacks even a "modicum of humor." This fictitious character never outgrew the helplessness of his adolescent years—"ewiges Kind"—"verwachsen und in seinem Wollen verworren." As he advances in years he spends most of his time busying himself with trivial activities—"mit belangloser Geschäftigkeit und blossen Stochern, Gockern und bedächtigem Tändeln." He cannot plan and outline his poetic dreams but produces like an "apple tree." He, like the tree, has to bide the turn of the seasons, wait for the "orgastic relief," to bring forth the fruit of his pen. As to the merits of his works Goethe is as ignorant as the tree is of the "acids and esters" found in the apple.

If one should have overlooked a brief remark that the author

has read *Hermann und Dorothea* more than thirty times with American college students one might never guess that he is a "Germanist." For he heaps scorn on the "professors" and shows occasionally a deplorable lack of philological training. For instance when he speaks approvingly of Goethe's use of Alexandrine verse in *Die Mitschuldigen* "although Lessing had used blank verse;" or when in a discussion of *Urfaust* he speaks of witches' scenes and the "Knittelvers" as if it were its verse form. Lessing did not use blank verse until long after the *Mitschuldigen* was written, there is only one witches' scene in *Urfaust*, and "Knittelvers" occurs but in a few places of this early fragment as a pupil of Heusler—see page 172—should know. But what do such trivial facts mean to one who wants to show his psychoanalytical acumen? He rather speculates on Goethe's sex life. He finds that he was "unsinnlich," that most of his love affairs were figments of his poetic fancy, that at the bottom of his character lurked a "Schwindler." A more or less conscious self-deception allows him to fall passionately in love with a woman, preferably one who is married or at least betrothed—better still, one who lives at a safe distance so that the passionate intercourse may be carried on by mail. Such an unsubstantial passion is fanned until he has once again relieved himself, a new poetic work is produced, whereupon the soulmate is dropped.

Meyer does not think highly of most of the fruit his "apple tree" bore during the recurring productive seasons. Space forbids the discussion of his objections to any of the major works. What he has to say about one poem may suffice to show his unreliability as an interpreter of Goethe's poetry. On pages 98 ff. he discusses *Willkommen und Abschied*, a landmark in the development of modern German lyrics. Forgetting his pattern of "leidenschaftliche Spannung" and "orgastische Befreiung" he prefers the later "corrections" written in cold blood. The line "Und fort, wild, wie ein Held zur Schlacht" disturbs Meyer's mood: "Die zweite Zeile wurde später aus ihrer stimmungstörenden barocken Fassung zu mehr leidenschaftlicher Eile umgedichtet: 'Es war getan fast eh gedacht'."

Aside from the prosiness, what is the poetic purpose of the rider's courage which is a thousand times greater than the thousand threats which night created if our attention is to be focused solely on his speed? Ah! Here Meyer sparks with the genius of a veteran drill master of grammar: "Das Geniale der zweiten Strophe war aber . . . der Komparativ eines nicht steigerungsfähigen Wortes: 'Doch tausendfacher war mein Mut'."

It is a popular though mistaken notion that Goethe cast a too superficial glance at his youthful poem when he was describing a week-end ride to Sesenheim and got slightly confused weatherwise: "So stark ich auch ritt, überfiel mich doch die Nacht. Der Weg

war nicht zu verfehlen, und der Mond beleuchtete mein leidenschaftliches Unternehmen. Die Nacht war windig und schauerlich."

Neither the young nor the old poet got his meteorological observations mixed up. But Meyer is hopelessly confused. He finds the roaring of the wind incompatible with the gentle beating of its wings and the moon sleepily peering through the haze.—The last two stanzas also puzzle Meyer. He wonders whether they are to be read as the poet's vision of his arrival at and departure from his beloved, or as the description of what actually took place. He winds up with the surprising statement: "Die Zweifel darüber kommen daher, dass die Schlussstrophe den ganzen Ritt vergisst: Der Dichter bleibt, die Geliebte geht."

Enough of this. I wish I could say at least a word of unstinted praise of Meyer, the "biologist." For his presentation of Goethe's morphological studies is the best part of his book. But a biologist who writes a page of platitudes about the *Mailed* and does not even mention the *Blütendampf*; who bases his discussion of the poem *Auf dem Zürichersee* on the later colorless version instead of the original

Ich saug an meiner Nabelschnur
Nun Nahrung aus der Welt.

—and this in the chapter "Die Frankfurter Lyrik"—; who finally does not even mention Gretchen's *Lied am Spinnrad* with the biologically most significant lines

Mein Schoss, Gott, drängt sich
Nach ihm hin

has forfeited our confidence. To be sure, Meyer labors under the mistaken notion that the young Goethe used "nature" only as décor, "Staffage." Still he realizes that basic biological ideas are found already in Goethe's *Rede zum Shakespeare Tag* of 1771. Meyer states that Goethe deserves our "loyal efforts to penetrate the deeper meaning of his writings." Unfortunately he practiced but rarely what he preaches. His actual approach is best characterized by his slurring reference to the four types of reverence in the pedagogical provinces as "die berühmten Ehrfurchten" in the "lächerliche Kadettenanstalt." He says himself that the Goethe student has to weigh the poet's words and to track down all possible leads furnished in his letters, diaries, known reading interests and the like. He reproaches his fellow investigators of Goethe's scientific studies for having failed to read the books which helped to shape the ideas contained in them. He himself, however, has overlooked at least one author, Swedenborg, whose views are reflected in Goethe's writings, from the *Mailed* to the last scene in *Faust II*. Perhaps Meyer was carried away by his admiration of the scholarly exactness, the "Akribie" of Max Morris. Unfortunately Morris in his investigation of Swedenborg's influence on

Goethe was neither scholarly nor exact, as Meyer would have quickly realized if only he had followed up the lead of Goethe's letter to Steinauer of October 1776 in which he asks for a copy of Oetinger's *Swedenborgs und anderer irdische und himmlische Philosophie*, 1765. One glance into the two slim volumes would have shown him where the poet found his inspiration for so much that remained enigmatic to Meyer. And if he had gone to the further trouble of consulting Tafel's *Swedenborg Documents* he would have found a wealth of information that is exceedingly helpful in getting better acquainted with what was going on around 1770. If then he had read through Swedenborg's theosophical books—so easily accessible nowadays whereas Goethe had to journey to Darmstadt, the only place in Germany at that time where he could find them; and if he had crowned his labor by studying the several volumes containing Swedenborg's contributions to science: Meyer with his scientific equipment, which for a teacher of German at an American college is really astounding, could have made a worthwhile contribution to Goethe philology. Meyer has been very uncivil to his fellow Goethe-students. He is, no doubt, prepared for scathing reviews of his book. I hope he will not grow embittered but show us what he can really do in his special field, the elucidation of Goethe's biological thoughts.

G. C. L. SCHUCHARD

New York University

The Harley Lyrics. The Middle English Lyrics of MS. Harley 2253. Edited by G. L. BROOK. Manchester University Press, 1948. Pp. 126. 10/6.

Everything best worth remembering in the old lyrical poetry (wrote W. P. Ker) is contained in MS. Harley 2253, a miscellaneous parchment folio of 141 leaves, of mixed Latin, Anglo-Norman, and English verse and prose. A complete list of the contents of the Ms. is reprinted by Bøddeker¹ from the description in the *Catalogue of the Harleian MSS in the BM*, v. 2 (1808), no. 2253. Unfortunately, even Bøddeker's list is incomplete (omitting *Erbe toc of erbe*), and there has never been a complete edition even of the English pieces in the MS. Bøddeker's edition included all but one of the Harley political, secular and religious lyrics, but it did not reprint any of the French and Latin (which ought not to be separated from the English in studying the lyrics), and it did not print the Geste of King Horn. On the importance of the non-English pieces, one example must suffice, from the *Song of the*

¹ K. Bøddeker, *Altenglische Dichtungen des MS. Harl. 2253* (Berlin, 1878), pp. ix-xiii.

Traillebastons, previously printed by Wright in his *Political Songs* (and earlier by Ritson):

Cest rym fust fet al bois desouz un lorer,
Là chaunte merle, russinole, e crye l'esperuer.
Escrit estoit en parchemyn pur mout remenbrer,
Et gitté en haut chemyn, qe um le dust trouer.²

These lines must be considered with the more frequently quoted lines from *Dum Ludis Floribus* which give an opposite view of the provenance of the lyrics:

Scripsi hec carmina in tabulis;
mon ostel est en mi la vile de Paris;
may y sugge namore, so wel me is;
3ef hi de3e for loue of hire, duel hit ys.
(Brook ed., p. 55)

It is a regretful omission that this latest edition (as well as the still-promised EETS edition) does not include the important non-English part of the MS.

Brook did not intend his edition to include political songs (though it might very easily have done so), and he states that it "contains all the other short poems which can properly be described as lyrics." A reviewer cannot quarrel too much with an editor's statement that he excludes the translation of *Dulcis iesu memoria* (Böddeker GL VIII) "because of its length and because the type to which it belongs is sufficiently well represented by *Suete Iesu King of Blysse* (15)," but it is difficult to understand why *Dum Ludis Floribus* (of which only two of twenty lines are in English) is included yet other macaronic lyrics are not included. All will not agree with Brook's editorial policy of expanding contractions without notice, and of not following the MS in word-division, punctuation, and the use of capitals; all will find Brook consistent with that policy, and this reviewer has not found any fault with the text in checking it against microfilm. In this respect, this new edition is a marked improvement over Carleton Brown's editing of the same lyrics.

Scholars and students who have worked with the glossaries to Brown's three volumes of Middle English verse have found them inadequate, and here Brook does a most valuable job. The Middle English glossary is far richer than Brown's, and there is a separate Anglo-Norman glossary (which few editors of Middle English verse have attempted). Brook gives the Old English forms (which were only occasionally given by Brown), as well as Old Norse, Old French and others. There are many words not glossed by Brown, and corrections of some incorrectly or inadequately glossed. Brook apparently has made good use of the contributions by Kemp Malone and R. J. Menner,³ to a greater extent than would

² F. 113 v^o. Wright, *Political Songs* (Camden Soc., 1839), p. 236.

³ *ELH*, II (1935), 58-65, and *MLN*, LV (1940), 243-9.

appear from his usual disagreement with them in the Textual Notes. For example, *feyne* is not glossed by Brown but is by Malone (*loc. cit.*, p. 64), whom Brook follows; Brown's gloss of *sucre* as 'succour' is corrected by Malone to 'sugar' and is so glossed by Brook.

Brook's Notes tend to be disappointing, for they are chiefly textual; his critical judgement is excellent on textual matters, however—e. g., his notes on No. 3, 'Annot and John.' While his paraphrases of difficult lines are useful, he does not often enough attempt elucidation or evaluation of the individual lyrics. The notes are compact, and generally to the point; they are obviously the product of many years of living with these lyrics, and this doubtless explains the failure to give sources in the notes—as, for example, his rewording of Menner's note to lines 24-6 of 'The Three Foes of Man,' and his correction of Brown's reading of line 17 (*stybye*) of No. 6 (anticipated by Malone, *loc. cit.*, p. 64). More frequently, Brook does not indicate when there is further material to be found in Brown (e. g., No. 30, 'Man in the Moon'), or when his notes apparently are based upon the earlier notes of Brown (as in his identification of the heroes and heroines of romance mentioned in 11.41-50 of 'Annot and John').

In Brook's Select Bibliography (which goes back to Ritson and Wright, and includes Kölbing's review of Böddeker's edition), I note the omission of several relevant studies, and only one work later than 1941, although the Preface is dated February 1948. Rossell Hope Robbins' two studies on Middle English Religious Lyrics and the Franciscans (*MLN*, LIII [1938], 239-45, and *JEGP*, xxxix [1940], 230-8) have an important bearing on the origins of Harley 2253, and one should especially note Robbins' observation (*JEGP*, xxxix, 236 n.) that "Nearly half the English religious lyrics of Harley 2253, therefore, occur in earlier *friar* books, and no English poem has been copied from the Harley 2253 collection." This, taken with Brown's comments (Introd., *English Lyrics XIIIth Century*), gives a much clearer picture than Brook's of the background of the religious lyrics. Similarly, the studies of Margaret Medary and Arthur C. L. Brown on Stanza-Linking in Middle English Verse (*Rom. Rev.*, vii [1916], 243-70 and 271-83) are omitted from the bibliography; I do not know whether these were known to Brook, but Brown there noted (pp. 266-7 n.) the many examples of stanza-linking by alliteration in this MS.—which modifies Brook's definition of *concatenatio*, or stanza-linking, as "two successive stanzas or two successive parts of the same stanza . . . linked together by the repetition of a few words." Brook does not include under his discussion of Rhyme the internal rhyme that occurs in Harley lyrics—as in 'Lord þat lenest vs lyf ant lokest vch-an lede' (Brown, XIIIth C., No. 74, which Brook does not print). The following seems important enough to be added to such

a Select Bibliography. Wright's *Political Songs* contains four French political songs from Harley 2253 not printed elsewhere. Ker's *English Literature: Mediaeval* is quoted in the Preface but not listed in the Bibliography. I would add the still valuable studies of Saintsbury on metre and Ten Brink on general literary aspects, and for special aspects W. P. Jones on the Pastourelle (Harvard, 1931), Wehrle on the Macaronic Hymn tradition (Cath. Univ. Press, 1933), and Elinor Rees (in *Stanford Studies*) for a further enumeration of Provençal conventions. For the Latin Background, Parry's edition of Andreas Capellanus (New York, 1941) should be added to that of Trojel; and C. S. Lewis's *Allegory of Love* surely belongs, as well as the studies of Father Alex. Denomy (in *Med. Studies*) on Courtly Love. For the Romance Background, G. Paris and E. Faral are essential, and one misses the names of U. T. Holmes (particularly his valuable *History of Old French Literature*) and Gustave Cohen. E. K. Chambers' essay on 'Some Aspects of Mediaeval Lyric' is noted, but not his later volume in the *Oxford History of English Literature* which contains a much more useful bibliography than his early anthology and some modifications of his earlier views.

I have noted one *erratum* in this most carefully edited volume: *Par* for *par* on p. 81. It is a welcome addition to any medieval shelf, and its text and glossary are indeed most careful and valuable; but Carleton Brown's volumes (and especially their notes) have not been displaced, and for some things one must still go back to Bøddeker.

R. J. SCHOECK

Cornell University

Diderot Studies. Edited by OTIS E. FELLOWS and NORMAN L. TORREY. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1949. Pp. XII + 191.

Presenting the work of graduate students, this collection is of high but uneven level. It is unfortunately introduced by a poorly organized, opaquely written piece, Miss Alice G. Green's "Diderot's Fictional Worlds." Even good scholarship is no excuse for bad form. Although there is a real contribution, in some acute observations on the technique and meaning of *Jacques le Fataliste*, the discussion is disconcerting, often forced, inconclusive or inconsistent. At the beginning we are led to expect a revelation of the kind of world Diderot would have liked to live in (although the quotations about his *malaise* are actually more psychological than intellectual), but this discussion leads absolutely nowhere. Miss Green's main thesis is the startling modernity of Diderot's novel-

istic techniques. Since her purpose is to disprove what Mornet and F. C. Green have written, she does not give full value to the classical influence, to that of Sterne, nor to D.'s attempts at humor (what is termed D.'s worry about verisimilitude (p. 18-19) is probably only an attempt at humor or satire). Miss Green seems to partake of an attitude now too prevalent—the desire to “prove” something about D. (generally a preselected theory or an arbitrary pattern, as in Miss de Commaille's article). We do not know that *Jacques* would not have appealed to his contemporaries. The “facing forward” toward creating an impression on the mind of the public is classical, as is the gradual unfolding of character (cf. Molière). Miss Green is unable to decide whether D. is playing the vital role of “Marlowe,” or whether his comments are “really extraneous,” whether D. uses “the lie” (p. 4) or only strict truth (p. 17), whether incidents are important for the characters or only for the readers (p. 8-9). At the end there is no clear demonstration that D. intended his efforts to initiate a serious method of writing fiction, rather than as a *tour de force*, a paradox, a brilliant intellectual exercise.

The article by Otis E. Fellows and Miss Green, “D. and the Abbé Dulaurens,” is by contrast a model of lucid exposition. The authors reveal a curious parallelism between two eighteenth century minds that in actual life hardly touched each other, but judiciously avoid any suggestion of influence. The prime value of such a study is to remind us that even an original mind like D.'s is the product of the intellectual atmosphere of his times, of ideas that are “in the air” or implied by the climate of opinion. Too many recent appraisals of D. have turned into paeans of his originality, have cut him out from the matrix that nourished him. With some, hero worship has reached a point where frank criticism is frowned upon; we find Mr. Vartanian (I do not intend to include him in this criticism) describing D. euphemistically as a “versatile thinker” when he refers to his frequent change of views (p. 47). To return to this illuminating article: the authors distinguish neatly between determinism and fatalism. The ensuing discussion, however, while performing the service of reopening the question, calls for an even more careful exploration of the implications of the words “determinism,” “freedom” and “choice.” A choice (selection) may be rigidly determined and exclude moral responsibility; similarly with modifiability. A materialist must be a mechanist, and there can be no (free) choice, unless one admits mind. What is really shown here is that man himself is a part of the cause-effect process. But is the “desired end” (p. 77) freely chosen or mechanically determined? Space forbids more adequate discussion in this review.

The most brilliant and important contribution is Mr. Aram Vartanian's “From Deist to Atheist.” Here we have the most lucid, logical and best documented study of the early evolution of D.'s

thinking. Mr. Vartanian analyzes the specific character of D.'s deism, and the influence of current biological thought, which he shows to be the determining factor in its movement. His work is a significant step towards a fuller understanding of D.'s intellectual history. Two minor points: one continues to wonder that a feeling of vitalism in nature should have led to materialism; it is also not clear how Mr. Vartanian reconciles the admitted atheism of the *Lettre sur les aveugles* (p. 55) with the statement (p. 60) that D. continued to believe in God as the creator of Nature.

Of great interest is Mr. Milton Seiden's study, "Rameau and D.'s Neveu." By careful investigation Mr. Seiden proves that the "Nephew's" personality and ideas are in fact a close portrait of the original J. F. Rameau. However, this fact does not justify Mr. Seiden's conclusion that the *Neveu de Rameau* is purely a social satire. It does not *per se* refute interpretations that also consider the work as an "interior dialogue" between two aspects of Diderot's thinking that are known to exist elsewhere in his writings. There is nothing to gainsay the claim that D.'s interest in Rameau may be accounted for, in part, by his seeing in him a model of a certain type of amorality, a model that D. perfected by the additions that Mr. Seiden points out. Also, contrary to Mr. Seiden's intention, the exactness of the portrait may only bear out Faguet's assertion that D. was a wonderful observer, but could not "create character."

Mlle de Commaille studies D. as pre-symbolist. Her general thesis is correct, but much of it is well known. Much, too, is strained, not necessarily pre-symbolist, possibly just pre-romantic. There is no clear distinction between intuition, *sensibilité* and imagination, and the discussion of the role of the last two is inadequate. One doubts the value of accumulating random thoughts, which by favorable extension and hedged with admitted reservations, may be construed as fitting into a certain pattern.

Mr. Edward J. Geary presents a useful and scholarly investigation of the origin, composition and publication of *Les deux amis de Bourbonne*. Mr. P. C. Oustinoff discusses recent Russian work on D., and claims convincingly that the *Essai sur les études en Russie*, attributed to him, is Grimm's work.

LESTER G. CROCKER

Goucher College

Robert Henryson. By MARSHALL W. STEARNS. New York, Columbia University Press, 1949. Pp. 156. \$2.50.

This book consists of seven chapters, as follows: "The Poetry and Life of Robert Henryson," "Politics, Religion, and Law," "The Socio-Economic Background," "Henryson and Chaucer," "The Planet Portraits," "The Meeting of the Lovers," and "The Poet

as Humanitarian." As this Table of Contents suggests, the study breaks down into special topics. As a whole it is hardly definitive, but it is not superficial. The chapter on the Planet Portraits, the longest in the book, is an exegesis upon about one third of the *Testament of Cresseid*; that on the Meeting of the Lovers analyzes Henryson's adaptation of traditional psychological theories in a single scene of the same poem. But in these two chapters—the second is an acute study of Henryson's finest dramatic achievement—and in the course of the rest of the book, we get first and last a reasonably comprehensive evaluation of the *Testament* as a whole. The *Fables* are likewise adequately assayed, if also in somewhat dispersed fashion. The short poems, however, almost completely slip through the grid, and this, as regards some of them, such as "Robene and Makyne" and the provocative "Sum Practysis of Medecyne," is a pity.

Mr. Stearns is concerned to show that Henryson, unlike the other poets of his time (and also unlike the author of *Piers Plowman*), feels a real bias in favor of the oppressed commons and champions them against their chief oppressors, the feudal lords, and that, furthermore, he looks upon the rising bourgeoisie with a jaundiced eye. These points are made persuasively and interestingly. More than once Mr. Stearns's knowledge of fifteenth-century Scotland enables him to bring order out of seeming chaos in the characterizations of the *Fables*. For example, the Fox in *The Fox and the Wolf* is a baffling character: he speaks of himself at once as a thief, as one who cannot work and is ashamed to beg, and as one of the simple folk, who yet would pretend to gentility. Of this character the author says:

The evidence is tantalizingly confused and contradictory, yet it does more or less describe a group of people with whom the poet might well have sympathized—the dispossessed gentry,

and he goes on to explain that the reversion of lands consequent upon the ceaseless feuds of the time uprooted many a landowner. "Caught between two cultures in a changing society," these turned perforce to robbery; they scorned manual labor and looked up to the nobility. "It would have been quite natural for the poet to be greatly interested in this group," he concludes, "and to find qualities that he liked and disliked, as the fable indicates, in these rebellious victims of the unquiet times" (page 117).

In four of the *Fables*, Mr. Stearns holds, Henryson more or less covertly satirizes particular, identifiable evildoers (see pp. 15-25). Since almost nothing is known of the life of Henryson and not a great deal is known about the personalities and conflicts of his turbulent times, the establishment of such a thesis is as difficult as it is desirable. Some of Mr. Stearns's evidences are impressive, and he is able to point out that those putative satiric allusions which would expose the poet to the greatest danger occur in precisely the one

Fable (*The Lion and the Mouse*) which the poet chooses to cast in the form of a dream vision and put in the mouth of Æsop. It may be noted, however, that if Mr. Stearns's whole case is valid and all that he holds to be satiric allusion is actually that, we must believe that Henryson, in four of his Fables, aimed shafts (1) at the weak and slothful James III and also at the traitorous nobles who kidnapped him in 1466; (2) at the rebellious Lord of the Isles, Angus; (3) at James III's plebeian favorites, who were particularly hated by the nobility; and (4) at James III's treacherous younger brother, the Duke of Albany, who was something of an idol to the nobles. It will be seen that the allusions, if actual, fail to crystallize into any simple and obvious pattern of partisanship. Though a pattern of some sort is thinkable, probably not all readers will be convinced that Henryson is dealing in satire of individuals in these four Fables rather than in the generalized social and moral satire characteristic of the remaining nine Fables and, in fact, of the bulk of his poetry.

With its emphasis on political and social background, the present volume leads the reader to speculate on the differences between Henryson and his master Chaucer in so far as these may not be due simply to temperament and degree of genius. What the modern reader misses most in the *Fables*, earthy and often brilliant in humor as they are, is the nearly total lack of that amused indulgence toward the chicanery of congenital rogues which marks Chaucer and so many other writers of fabliaux and beast fables. To a certain extent this relative lack is due to the moral earnestness of the Scot, no doubt, but Mr. Stearns, by reminding us of the lingering of feudalism in Scotland and the absence even in Henryson's day of a large, well established middle class, may have pointed the way toward a supplementary explanation: perhaps the rogue or picaro is truly comic as such only in a society in which great numbers of people live righteously and dully according to a solid code of "business" ethics. The realism of the much earlier Continental and English fabliaux is to be found full-blown in Henryson, but this particular picaresque quality is rare indeed.—However this may be, Mr. Stearns's interesting book at least achieves its goal of presenting Henryson not as Scottish Chaucerian No. 2 (or No. 1 or No. 3) but as a figure living in, and aware of, a social and political milieu.

H. M. SMYSER

Connecticut College

The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume 1, 1760-1776, pp. lviii, 679; *Volume 2, January 1777 to June 1779*, pp. xxiv, 665. JULIAN P. BOYD, Editor; LYMAN H. BUTTERFIELD and MINA R. BRYAN, Associate Editors. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.

The first volume of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* was presented to the nation, personified in the President of the United States, at an impressive ceremony in Washington in May 1950. Within six months the second volume had appeared. The two afford the scholar ample material for judging the quality and quantity of one of the greatest editorial undertakings of our national history. As a potential model for future editions of the writings of other eminent Americans, these volumes deserve and will receive the careful scrutiny of specialists and general readers in many fields.

Volume One, covering the years from the beginnings of Jefferson's correspondence in 1760 through his public papers of 1776, also offers an introduction to and explanation of the whole project. The planned fifty-odd volumes will be organized chronologically and topically. The first four-fifths, or roughly forty volumes, will present the "writings and recorded actions" such as letters, legislative bills, travel journals, speeches, and advertisements. Every available letter written by or to Jefferson will be included in one form or another. Letters by him are to appear in their entirety except in cases of duplication; letters to him in full, in summary, or in record entry, depending upon significance. The second series of volumes, an estimated one-fifth of the whole, will be devoted to large units of material naturally permitting classified arrangement. Among these latter will be the *Autobiography*, *Notes on the State of Virginia*, and the *Manual of Parliamentary Practice*, as well as architectural and other drawings, literary and linguistic papers, and documents pertaining to the University of Virginia. A supplementary collection of papers belonging in the chronological series, a biographical register of correspondents and the more important persons mentioned, and elaborate indices will constitute the three or four final volumes of the series.

The editorial method to be pursued is succinctly summarized in fourteen pages of the Introduction. Jefferson was a master of the felicitous phrase but not of the facile pen. In other words, he revised a great deal in arriving at the form he wished to present, and he kept copies of many or all drafts. Often these survive when the fair copy has disappeared. Also at various times he used his letter press and polygraph to produce duplicate copies almost or entirely indistinguishable, and then emended them singly. These and many other problems of text—such as idiosyncrasies of capitalization and spelling, and expansions, interpolations, and deletions—are solved by an adherence to set, scholarly, and logical

rules of procedure. Every kind of note and symbol is carefully defined. The literary or historical scholar who copes with similar though usually lesser problems will read this exposition of organization and method with almost as great an interest as he will the primary materials to follow, for it forms an excellent handbook of scholarly editing.

But all this preliminary matter takes up only fifty-eight pages of a seven-hundred-and-thirty-page book. The first letter of Volume One is from the seventeen-year-old Jefferson to John Harvie, and quite naturally concerns his schooling. The youth sets forth what he considers the advantages of going to college—an appropriate inaugural for the long career in search, and attainment, of “knowledge.” Courtships, legal disputes, landowner’s problems, make up the bulk of the letters before 1774. But as early as 1771 the twenty-eight-year-old Jefferson was answering the kind of enquiry he was to receive for another half century: what books would you recommend for a modest but model library? He enclosed an interesting list, and in the letter commented upon his recommendation of a group of novels in a sentence which indicates the nature of his philosophical justification of all his enquiries in “Science:”

A little attention however to the nature of the human mind evinces that the entertainments of fiction are useful as well as pleasant. That they are pleasant when well written, every person feels who reads. But wherein is it’s utility, asks the reverend sage, big with the notion that nothing can be useful but the learned lumber of Greek and Roman reading with which his head is stored? I answer, every thing is useful which contributes to fix us in the principles and practice of virtue. . . . [I, 76]

Other items of the first volume which will interest the literary student particularly are the three letters concerning Macpherson’s *Ossian* and Jefferson’s tastes in poetry, and the five printed variants or drafts of the *Declaration of Independence*, with closely-packed notes making clear their relationship. The latter alone is a model of comprehensive, concise, and yet unostentatious scholarship.

Volume Two, covering only two and a half years up to the time of Jefferson’s elevation to the governorship of Virginia, contains relatively little of literary interest in the narrow or broad sense. The second half of the book is devoted entirely to the presentation of Jefferson’s “revisals” of the Laws of Virginia. They do show his enormous legal and historical learning, and two of them, those concerning education and religious freedom, embody some of the more felicitous phrasings and lofty ideas of his career. The first half of Volume Two contains shorter documents, business letters, a few personal notes of no great significance, and the beginnings of the correspondence with John Adams. This last is an expression of two obviously young men, highly intelligent, and deeply concerned for their country. The mellow learning and shining wit (on Adams’ part), the considered judgment which came with

maturity in the 1812-1826 period of this exchange may be here in embryo, but their presence is not felt.

All in all, however, one does get in these first volumes in which young Jefferson speaks on and off the record an adequate idea of the way his mind and life will tend. His theories of equality and representative government, of the problem of the negro slave in America, of public education and of private learning, his personal tastes in living and in literature, are all here indicated. In most cases his concepts in these matters developed, in some they evolved, in some few they almost reversed, and in some they remained static. But the young statesman was thinking and acting upon the problems that concerned him and his world. The *Princeton Papers* are showing us exactly when, what, and how he thought.

One small criticism this reader advances hesitantly regarding these admirably edited volumes. The type for the explanatory and textual notes is so small that continuous reading of a column or two of it becomes most painful. Cost naturally was a major consideration, but one wishes that some way could have been found to make these interesting and valuable materials more easily readable.

RICHARD BEALE DAVIS

The University of Tennessee

Some Modern American Poets. By JAMES G. SOUTHWORTH.
Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1950. Pp. viii + 180.

Professor Southworth has written an honest and independent series of essays on the following poets: Dickinson, Robinson, Frost, Stevens, Jeffers, MacLeish, Cummings, Benét, Crane. His treatment is unpretentious, the work of a sincere enthusiast who has disciplined himself. I find much to admire in the writer of these essays but—I wish it were not so—little in the essays themselves. (It would not make any real difference but I cannot help wondering about some of the choices and some of the notable omissions, both unexplained.)

I think a critic may perhaps do very well with practically no esthetic at all, if he has the imaginative power (and a sense of the right place) to get inside a work of art. Or he may do pretty well with a complete esthetic and little imaginative power. But if he falls in between we are not likely to learn much from him, and that has been my experience with this book. Professor Southworth relies heavily on judgment and taste—which means that he approaches his poets with ideal measurements fixed clearly in mind. Before judging, he makes an energetic though inadequate effort to understand a poet by first analyzing his thought and then his art. But

the analysis that is about to be referred to pre-formed standards cannot, of course, discover what is beyond the scope of those standards. The critic would need, at least, either a better esthetic or more imaginative freedom. When Professor Southworth turns to technical analysis, he is sympathetic but limited (see, for instance, pp. 38, 81, 100-101), and what is more serious, unaware of his limitations.

This is how he describes his critical position: "What I have attempted is to appraise the work of each [poet] as absolute poetry according to the tenets of classical criticism. My approach has been an aesthetic one. This basis of judgment rests on years of close association with the acknowledged great poets as well as those under discussion." I do not know what "*the tenets of classical criticism*" are, but in Professor Southworth's essays they permit a good deal of judgment that gets along without insight and without enough patient effort to understand that a poet may be saying what has its own inner logic, whether or not "*the tenets*" can measure it. They permit a good deal of biographical psychologizing that seems, at the very least, strange in an approach that announces itself as "*aesthetic*" and aims to appraise poetry as "*absolute poetry*." At times it seems much more than strange—as this of Hart Crane: "Being an only child, friendships meant more to him than if he had had brothers and sisters with whom he could have been close." Or this unqualified and careless remark on E. A. Robinson: "Poetically, 'Isaac and Archibald' is superior because the poet more completely merges himself in his subject." Or this, delivered without irony: "Like every well-adjusted person, Mr. Frost is not troubled by death, is not perturbed by the vast unknown reaches of the universe, nor by the nature of the hereafter if there be one, nor about the nature or power of God."

Another of "*the tenets*" to which Professor Southworth is committed is the value (though in "*absolute poetry*") of affirmation. On Robinson he pronounces: "This quality of negation in his work will eventually militate against him." But Frost is different—he measures up to all the tenets, and seems to have none of the faults, in any of his poems, that some critics have suspected. And especially: "He can see, therefore, all that Hardy sees, but he can look at it with a spirit of affirmation. . . . Because he has not flinched from facing reality and has adjusted himself to it, he is more free from pessimism than any other modern poet. Of all the poets in the present selection he is the one who has seen most clearly . . . he has kept the clarity of his vision unimpaired. . . . He has maintained a refreshing sanity." If affirmation alone could do it, Frost would seem to have outstripped "*the acknowledged great poets*" who compose Professor Southworth's basis of judgment.

Apparently connected with the value of affirmation is the judgment of time, which Professor Southworth thinks necessary, or likes,

to invoke—sometimes in the language of classical jargon (“survival possibilities”), sometimes in more formal cadence (“would have assured him greater longevity”). I should find it difficult, even if other considerations did not interfere, to trust the esthetic judgment of any critic whose prose does not reflect good taste and a good ear. The writing of decent prose ought to be a more widely accepted obligation by students of literature.

ARNOLD STEIN

University of Washington

Charles Dickens. By JACK LINDSAY. New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. Pp. 459. \$4.75.

One of the most astonishing phenomena of the past decade has been the revaluation of Dickens. Previously most critics and scholars either ignored him entirely or condemned his novels as a mixture of sentimentality, melodrama, and caricature. Now that theories of the novel are no longer dominated by naturalism, Dickens is suddenly hailed as one of the major creative writers of all time.

Mr. Lindsay's biography is the most enthusiastic expression of this view, and he makes a good case for it. In his prefatory note he announces that “Blake and Dickens are the two writers who hold the key to the nature of our cultural crisis today.” His interpretation of Dickens's life and character is largely Freudian, and his discussion of the novels shows a few hints of the Marxist line; but his views are not rigidly dogmatic.

Giving liberal space to Dickens's childhood and youth, he lays particular emphasis upon the boy's ambivalent love for his sister Fanny, in addition to the more familiar themes of the debtors' prison and the blacking factory. In the later years, Mr. Lindsay naturally makes the Ellen Ternan episode pivotal in his narrative, using the phrase “the Dickensian Lie” to dismiss those authorities who still hesitate to grant it full credence.

As to Dickens's social views, Mr. Lindsay dwells upon his fundamental antagonism to the four cornerstones of Victorian society—religion (especially Evangelical Protestantism), the English administration of justice, parliamentary politics, and industrial capitalism. The author asserts that these antipathies, all of which grew out of Dickens's early personal experiences, developed into a coherent and profoundly radical vision of society, “a complete break between him and the values of the money world.” Lindsay implies that this growth and deepening of the novelist's social philosophy was due to his freedom from formal schooling; having been obliged to educate himself, he continued the process into

maturity, constantly "seeking for the clue of historical development in his world."

Mr. Lindsay is effective in showing the relationships between the novels and the emotional experiences that inspired them. He is adept at noting recurrent images. In his admiration for Dickens's intuitive power of symbolism, he sets high value upon such generally neglected novels as *The Old Curiosity Shop* and *Barnaby Rudge*. On the other hand, his addiction to autobiographical implications drives him to the questionable theory that Dickens unconsciously portrayed himself as Daniel Quilp.

Another stimulating element in this book is the frequent linking of the Dickens novels with the literary scene of his day. Carlyle's intense influence, for instance, affected Dickens at the moment when his individual rebelliousness had made contact with the general unrest bursting forth in chartism, and therefore Carlyle served as an essential catalyst for Dickens's ideas. Again, it is pointed out that *Barnaby Rudge* began as an effort to rival the historical romances of Bulwer and Ainsworth, but was soon drawn into Dickens's characteristic symbology. A more startling suggestion is that clues to the mystery of *Edwin Drood* may be found in Lady Bulwer-Lytton's *Cheveley*.

Some readers may rebel against Mr. Lindsay's interpretations because he overworks them. The "death wish," in particular, which is plausibly evolved from Dickens's jealousy of his sister and grudge against his mother, is reiterated on page after page, long after the reader feels competent to recognize the implication for himself. Some minor items of evidence are unreasonably overstressed: two pages are given to analysing the sexual implications of a doggerel burlesque by George Colman, simply because Dickens once remarked that it had tickled his adolescent sense of humor.

Mr. Lindsay's style is distressingly uneven. At his best, he can present a critical discussion with precision and point, but elsewhere he lapses into the sloppiest of colloquialisms, and he is maddeningly addicted to incomplete predications. His notes are peculiarly useless: kenneled in the rear, they are not identified by either index-numerals or page-numbers, but merely by their sequence in the several chapters; and they are couched in a sort of telegraphic code, with the further offense of numerous abbreviations. The whole book is infested with misspellings of proper names.

LIONEL STEVENSON

University of Southern California

The Real Bernard Shaw. By MAURICE COLBOURNE, New Revised Edition. New York: Philosophical Library. 1949. Pp. x + 342. \$2.75.

This is an enlarged version of the book published by the same author under the same title in 1939. Both books arouse our interest because in them a man of the theatre, having had professional contacts with Shaw, attempts to draw the picture of the great old man whose long life came to an end in November 1950. Somewhat surprisingly Mr. Colbourne's earlier book devoted much more space to Shaw's personality and opinions than to his achievement as a dramatist. The new volume tries to remedy this defect by the inclusion of three new chapters on the dramatic writings and of a useful chart, offering full information concerning the order of composition and the first English and American productions of the plays. Additional illustrations and an "Annary," listing events both of Shaw's life and his times, are further new features of a book that does not compete with such full-length biographies as those by Archibald Henderson and Hesketh Pearson. Mr. Colbourne rather sets out to compose a companion volume to those two standard works, whose solidity and comprehensiveness he admires. In one respect, however, he claims an advantage over them: while they both came "straight from the Shavian circus," he himself was careful to work as much as possible without Shaw's help and supervision.

He shows his independence when he criticizes some of his author's more extravagant political opinions, e. g. his praise of the Soviet paradise and his disastrous speculations concerning the liquidation of undesirables, and when he shows that some of his pet economic theories are out of date. He could have been much more critical in his discussion of Shaw's vapid ideas on religion (pp. 277, 281, 309). On the whole he goes over the wide field of Shaw's ideas in a spirit of independent friendship, rejecting some and "falling for others, hook, line, and sinker," as he himself confesses (p. 36).

Although many readers will be grateful for this new introduction to Shaw's thought we regret that opinions loom so large again in the second version of Mr. Colbourne's book. We suspect that Shaw, the man of innumerable opinions, will prove much more perishable than Shaw, the dramatist, and that his claim to be a great man can only be substantiated by a critical appreciation of his dramatic art. So far all his biographers have taken Shaw at his own valuation, and have devoted more study to his thought than to his art. Mr. Colbourne's chapters on the dramatist and on the plays are factual and informative, but they do not offer an orderly analysis of Shaw's plays nor a sustained evaluation of his dramatic method.

In spite of the author's desire to write independently, he has not

given us a pioneer critical study. This is not one of the biographies of the future; it is instead one of the last portraits attempted by a contemporary in Shaw's lifetime. It is therefore strongly coloured by his opinion of himself, notwithstanding Mr. Colbourne's ambition to escape from the powerful fascination of his communicative hero. Shaw's sway over his mind appears also in his all too frequently tricky and journalistic style. Besides, the intellectual and literary world about Shaw is sometimes viewed and simplified through Shavian spectacles. The crude characterization of the Irish Renaissance on p. 58 is an instance of this. Two others may be found on p. 79 where we are made to think that Shakespeare was constantly on the bills of Henry Irving's Lyceum Theatre. In reality the great actor-manager produced only twelve Shakespearean plays during the twenty-four years of his tenure of the theatre, and favoured many authors beside Shakespeare—Ibsen and Shaw, however, were not among them. The fact that Jones and Pinero paved the way for the plays of Shaw by half-heartedly writing problem-dramas is ungratefully lost sight of on the same page. Even while defending Shakespeare against Shaw's strictures Mr. Colbourne's remarks on the old dramatist's "tumbling, chaotic greatness" show him fascinated by the new one's way of thinking. (p. 88)

Thus Mr. Colbourne's book has its shortcomings. In spite of them every newcomer to Shaw will find in it a lively and attractive introduction and the experienced student a reliable source book of facts as well as interesting summaries and comments with an unmistakable personal flavour.

RUDOLF STAMM

St. Gall, Switzerland

Walt Whitman of the New York Aurora. Edited by JOSEPH JAY RUBIN and CHARLES H. BROWN. State College, Pa.: Bald Eagle Press, 1950. VIII + 147 pp. \$4.00.

This volume is the result of a successful search for a file of the *New York Aurora*, a daily known to contain articles by Walt Whitman written when he was twenty-two years of age. Professor Rubin is to be congratulated on locating the file in the Paterson (N. J.) Library, thus making available more evidence on "a long foreground" in the development of *Leaves of Grass*. The discovery proves that Whitman not only contributed to the *Aurora* in 1842, but was its leading editor in March and April. After a careful sifting and editing of the file for those months, Professors Rubin and Brown have presented a selection of what they consider to be representative Whitman: essays and stories on New York life, political opinions, comments on literature and drama, sentimental pieces, and two poems (one signed Walter Whitman; the other W.).

However, the dilemma which confronted Professors Rubin and Brown is the same one which has bewildered scholars for half a century. Which contributions are really Walt's? As any student of nineteenth-century journalism is aware, certain characteristics, sometimes used as "internal evidence" for identification of Whitman's style, were typical of the editorial manner of the period; and not exclusive to Whitman. In their introduction the editors speak of Walt's "early prose mannerisms" as "his ejaculatory style, his long catalogues, his ignoring of conventional syntax, and the use of the dash." It would have been more precise to state that these "mannerisms" were at the same time to be found in Greeley's and Bennett's columns and in practically all of the penny press.

The *Aurora* selections contain much definite Whitman and much that seems questionable. There is no convenient signal to the reader showing how identification was made, and he is forced to pick his way through the annotation in an effort to find what evidence, if any, exists for authorship. Certainly a separation of the legitimate and doubtful Whitman material would have made this book even more valuable.

The editors have found an early self-portrait, a charming predecessor of the later deliberate self-puffery:

Then finding it impossible to do anything either in the way of "heavy business," or humor, we took our cane, (a heavy, dark beautifully polished, hook ended one,) and our hat, (a plain, neat fashionable one, from Banta's, 130 Chatham street, which we got gratis, on the strength of giving him this puff,) and sauntered forth to have a stroll down Broadway to the Battery. Strangely enough, nobody stared at us with admiration—nobody said "there goes the Whitman, of Aurora!"—nobody ran after us to take a better, and second better look—no ladies turned their beautiful necks and smiled at us—no apple women became pale with awe—no news boys stopped, and trembled, and took off their hats, and cried "behold the man what uses up the Great Bamboozle!"—no person wheeled out of our path deferentially—but on we went, swinging our stick, (the before mentioned dark and polished one,) in our right hand—and with our left hand tastily thrust in its appropriate pocket, in our frock coat, (a gray one.)

Just as important for a Whitman biographer is the sentence to be found in a banal filler called "Life and Love," printed on April 20, 1842: "The soul . . . so filled with the germs of illimitable progress . . ." Here is a seminal thought which he was to extend into one of the themes of *Leaves of Grass* and to use as a motif in "Germs."

Here, also, are new texts of articles later revised and reprinted in the Brooklyn *Eagle*. One of the poems is a revision of "Our Future Lot," the other a "parody" on the death and burial of McDonald Clarke.

Since the file of the *Aurora* was at the binder's, this reviewer was unable to obtain photostats to check the text. The annotation, however, is detailed and accurate. The typography, by Frances Boldereff, tends to be self-conscious; good printing is not obtrusive.

The task which confronted Professors Rubin and Brown was a baffling one. Any item in the text of the *Aurora* might have been written or at least rewritten by Whitman and to have culled authentic pieces from that mass of material is a credit to their devotion. In that wilderness of top-heavy adjectives and high-falutin' sentimentalities which was the journalism of the forties, they have traced Whitman's beginning steps into literature.

ROLLO G. SILVER

School of Library Science, Simmons College

Fra Salimbene da Parma e la storia politica e religiosa del secolo decimoterzo, by NINO SCIVOLETTO. Bari, Laterza, 1950.

Fra Salimbene da Parma (born 1221-died after 1288) is, if not the most important, the most fascinating and colorful of the memorialists of the Italian *Dugento*. Salimbene's work is important background material for the *Divina Commedia*. His *Cronica* has always been a favorite with cultural historians (see: G. G. Coulton, *From Francis to Dante*, 2nd ed., London 1907, which contains a partial translation into English; and Emile Gebhart, *Études Méridionales*, Paris, 1887, pp. 107-132, a singularly felicitous and delightful pen-portrait of the bizarre Salimbene). Lately, the popularity of the *Cronica* has been intensified by the fact that, at least in Italian literary historiography, the artificial barrier which separated writings in the vernacular, and hence authentically "Italian," and writings in Latin, has been pulled down. This has resulted in granting fully legitimate status, *qua* texts of Italian literature, to productions like Salimbene's *Cronica*, which too strict a construal of the designation "Italian literature" might have excluded from consideration. Simultaneously, in close connection with Dante studies, and with the "evangelical" circle of Buonajuti, there has been a notable revival of interest in the documents of the Joachimite movement (Salimbene both participated in, and was a testimony of, that movement). Prior to Scivoletto, between 1911 and 1947, the *Cronica* was re-examined by Cian, Bertolini, Bernini, Marvasi, Bocchi, Toffanin (*Il Secolo senza Roma*, 1942, pp. 147-165) and Momigliano (see, in his *Cinque Saggi*, 1945, pp. 71-108, a brilliant essay on *Motivi e forme della Cronica di Fra Salimbene*). The demand for an edition of Salimbene's text handier than the one supervised by Holder-Egger, which had to be sought in the ponderous, *peu maniable* series of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, was satisfied by Bernini (*Salimbene de Adam, Cronica*, Bari, 1942, 2 vols.). But although Balzani, Bertoni, Bizilli, E. Michael, B. Schmeidler, had illumined partial aspects of Salimbene, scholar-

ship could not yet muster a book embracing the whole work and figure of that chronicler. The volume under review fills this *desideratum*. It supplies all the hitherto available biographical data—critically sifted—on Salimbene, discusses the question of the sources (Siccardo da Cremona, Alberto Milioli da Reggio), delineates the psychological and ethical character of Salimbene, the criteria which prompted his political and religious judgments, and points out the importance of Salimbene for the history of Italian literature. Scivoletto's recommendation to Romance philologists that they should systematically study Salimbene's *Cronica* from the linguistic viewpoint should be heeded. Often, on reading Salimbene's vigorously colloquial, coarsely monkish Latin, *tel sur le papier qu'à la bouche* (as Montaigne would describe it), an image spontaneously presents itself: that of a stream still thinly coated with the surviving ice-crust of the winter months. But the crust is on the point of thawing; and underneath, quick and fresh, flows the vernacular in sudden gurglings and foamings and bubblings, ready to burst forth in joyous, finally unhampered, sparklingly expressive, springlike affirmation.

ELIO GIANTURCO

Washington, D. C.

Letters—Grave and Gay and Other Prose of John Banister Tabb.

Edited with Introduction and Notes by FRANCIS E. LITZ.

Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1950. Pp. xix + 266. \$4.00.

Professor Litz knew Father Tabb personally. He wrote *Father Tabb: A Study of His Life and Works* (Baltimore, 1923), edited *The Poetry of Father Tabb* (New York, 1928), and is preparing a definitive edition of the poems. For twenty-five years he has been tracking down Tabbiana, and this volume contains his discoveries: 308 letters by Tabb, 23 letters to him, and 14 miscellaneous prose pieces. Most of the letters, here arranged chronologically from 1873 until 1909, have not been published before. The addressees include the Laniers, Richard Malcolm Johnston, Thomas Randolph Price, and William Hand Browne. The best of the miscellaneous prose pieces, reprinted for the first time from the New York *Independent*, deal with Tabb's own life, his experiences as a blockade runner and war prisoner, and his associations with Sidney Lanier.

John Banister Tabb (1845-1909), poet-priest of Virginia and Maryland, came of an old family of Virginia Episcopalians. He was a Confederate blockade runner for two years and was captured and imprisoned for seven months at Point Lookout, Maryland, where he knew Lanier for four months. They were exchanged in February, 1865, and were drawn together again by poetry in 1877.

In 1872 Tabb became a Catholic. Earlier he had studied piano, taught school, and planned to enter the Episcopal ministry. After 1872 he attended St. Charles College in Maryland, taught school, attended St. Mary's Seminary, became a priest in 1884, and was professor of English at St. Charles College from 1885 until he became blind a year or two before his death. From 1877 on his poems appeared frequently in the better magazines, such as *Harper's*, the *Atlantic*, *Lippincott's* and the *New York Independent*. His first important volume was published in 1894, and thereafter he was regarded as one of the finer poets of the day. He specialized in short lyrics, restrained and polished in style. His prose is also compact and direct.

Father Tabb helped Mrs. Lanier edit Lanier's poetry (1884), he was fascinated by the poetry of Emily Dickinson from the time it first appeared, he championed Poe at every opportunity, he indicated that Poe and Keats and Coleridge and Shakespeare were his favorite poets. He was a Virginian first and an unreconstructed rebel always. He shunned publicity and personal contact with the public and all strangers. He was modest and witty and lovable, unselfish and generous. Through his reading he kept in touch with what was going on in spite of his retired life. He had high standards for his poetry and subjected himself to severe self-criticism. His chief concerns were religion, poetry, and music.

Professor Litz is to be highly commended for his devotion and persistence, his careful and scholarly editing, and his judicious criticism.

D. M. McKEITHAN

The University of Texas

William Dean Howells: Representative Selections. Edited by CLARA MARBURG KIRK and RUDOLF KIRK. New York: American Book Company, 1950. Pp. ccv, 394. \$3.50.

Despite his versatility—he was poet, journalist, dramatist, autobiographer, novelist, critic—Howells does not prosper under anthological treatment. Of his manifold legacy to posterity, only his novels have significant intrinsic value. His poetry (whatever Thomas Hardy may have said about it) is as poetry very bad. His criticism, worth noticing in any study of realism in American fiction, discloses serious limitations: he seems to have had no system of aesthetics, only habits, personal preferences, and revulsions. One is embarrassed to read so unperceptive a piece as his essay on Henry James. The dramatic farces, represented here by the entertaining "The Sleeping-Car," can claim no substantial recognition. The autobiographical works are better suited to representative treatment;

and they constitute, next to the novels, the writing in which Howells seemed most definitely master of his *métier*.

In presenting extracts from the novels, the present editors, Clara Marburg Kirk and Rudolf Kirk, have carried out a generally thankless task with a minimum of offense and a maximum of shrewdness. In each case they have provided brief, well-written summaries of the action not covered by the chapters printed; and they have interspersed these appropriately among the chapters instead of presenting them en bloc at the beginning of each novel. I do not recall having seen a more successful treatment of the problem involved. The choice of novels is a good one: *Indian Summer*, *Annie Kilburn*, *A Modern Instance*, *The Rise of Silas Lapham*, *A Hazard of New Fortunes*, *A Traveler From Altruria*. And happily for the success of the anthology, the novels occupy more space (235 pages) than all the other genres combined (about 160 pages).

The largest unit of the volume, exclusive of the extracts from the novels, is the richly-informative introduction. This must have called for countless hours of devoted, intelligent research. Running to 167 pages, it constitutes one of the longest discussions of Howells in print. It could easily have been expanded into a book. Indeed for comfortable reading it might well have been so expanded. The editors have the air of packing in their materials rather than of unfolding them. Moreover, in their zeal for getting everything into the record they have perforce left to the reader many matters of evaluation, as well as the problem of reconciling apparent inconsistencies. With its text heavily interlarded with quotation and its footnotes loaded with supplementary information, the work finally takes on the character of a superior handbook or compendium designed to present in the briefest compass the data necessary for an understanding of the phases of Howells' life and career. There is space for comparatively little background material. One is surprised to find the author of *Gates Ajar* (which sold 100,000 copies) referred to merely as "a Miss Phelps." Outright errors in the work, one is confident, are negligible. The annotated 31-page selected bibliography shows how thoroughly the editors have surveyed the entire field of scholarship relating to Howells.

Perhaps the most notable aspect of the introduction is its use of new material. The editors have consulted "several hundred unpublished letters" in libraries from the Huntington to the Houghton and points intermediate, as well as letters in private hands. Miss Mildred Howells has made it possible to "use sentences" from many of these. (A new edition of Howells' letters is clearly in order.) The volume as a whole is one for which scholars will be grateful and which some general readers will find useful if they wish to participate in the current re-discovery of Howells.

ALEXANDER COWIE

Wesleyan University

Les Légendes héroïques de Dietrich et d'Ermrich dans les littératures germaniques. By GEORGES ZINK. Bibliothèque de la société des études germaniques, 3. Lyons: I. A. C., 1950. Pp. xi, 298.

The student of Germanic heroic traditions faces unusually difficult and complicated problems. He deals with abundant but fragmentary and conflicting records of many kinds in various languages, chiefly Latin, medieval German, and Old Norse. The subject matter concerns figures and events prominent in the Germanic migrations between the third and sixth centuries, a period when records are extremely confused and chaotic, but the literary versions are separated from these figures and events by half a millennium in time and thousands of miles in space and have been modified by Viking and medieval cultures. Knowledge of the history of proper names and place names, folklore, and mythology is essential. Zink shows himself to be familiar with all the necessary materials.

The late medieval Low German ballad *Koninc Ermenrikes dot* offers a good illustration of the difficulties characteristic of these studies. Zink gives what may be regarded as the generally accepted view that this ballad is a derivative of an Eddic lay, the *Hamðismal*. He has overlooked an edition of the ballad in John Meier, *Deutsche Volkslieder*, I (Berlin, 1935), 21-27, No. 2. This would have led him to Meier's "Drei alte deutsche Volksballaden," *Jahrbuch für Volksliedforschung*, IV (1934), 37-56. In this article Meier maintains that the Low German ballad is intermediate between a lost High German version which had undergone some modification in the hands of a minstrel and Danish ballads. This derivation of the Low German ballad from a southern German source rests on place-names and comparisons with Middle High German literature. The defective text of the *Hamðismal*, "une oeuvre de toute beauté" (Zink, p. 178), makes its interpretation very difficult. In her *Legends of Ermanaric* (Berkeley, 1943), which Zink unfortunately did not see, Caroline Brady found in it echoes of Odinic myth, but Kemp Malone has rejected this idea (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XLII [1944], 450). A phrase in the *Hamðismal* that has a close parallel in the *Ragnarsdrapa* has seemed to some scholars to be an actual survival from a Gothic song; see Zink, p. 180, n. 2; Miss Brady, p. 43, n. 54. Such are characteristic difficulties in the path of the student of the Low German ballad. It is obvious that scholars have not yet reached anything like agreement about its origin, and this is a relatively simple problem in the history of the *Ermanarich* legends.

In its emphasis on the somewhat neglected *Dietrichs Flucht* and *Rabenschlacht*, Zink's survey differs from its predecessors. Although arranged in a novel fashion, it is nevertheless a complete account of

one of the great cycles of medieval German tradition. Zink has read widely in the sources, he has seen almost all of the pertinent investigations, and he argues cogently for his views. Consequently, he has made a useful contribution in a difficult field. By way of conclusion I note that no one seems to have commented on a curious reference to Ermanarich in Tannhäuser, 5. 21:

Salatin der twanc mit seiner milte der lande ein wunder.
sam tet der künec Ermenrich das laut ze Belagunder.

University of California

ARCHER TAYLOR

Bilder aus dem Frankfurter Goethe-Museum, herausgegeben von
ERNST BEUTLER und JOSEFINE RUMPF. Frankfurt am Main,
Verlag Der Goldene Brunnen. 1949. LXIV + 151 pp., 101
figs., 1 color pl.

This is a delightful and enlightening book. Its introduction of nearly sixty pages, written by a man whose knowledge in matters pertaining to Goethe is unexcelled, traces the development of art production and art collection in eighteenth century Frankfurt with masterly skill and with continuous reference to the influence exerted by those surroundings upon Goethe's later endeavors in the field of the visual arts. Among other things, the importance of the role which Goethe's father played in this development has for the first time been fully elucidated; many readers will derive an entirely new concept of the *Kaiserliche Rat* from these pages.

The story of art collecting in Frankfurt finds its natural conclusion in a report on the Goethe-Museum of the *Hochstift* and its contents which fortunately survived the holocaust of 1944. In spite of its brevity, this survey is most valuable by virtue of its careful and reticent evaluation of the paintings concerned. The Goethe-Museum is "ein Spiegel geistiger Kräfte des 18. Jahrhunderts" but "man kann an ihm keine Kunstgeschichte ablesen"; Beutler does not forget that the pictures have been assembled "nicht ihres Eigenwerts halber . . . sondern wegen ihres Ursprunges aus den Goethischen Lebensbezirken." The reader, browsing among the hundred and odd plates (which are on the whole of satisfactory quality), does well to keep this wise statement in mind, the more so as the commentaries to the individual paintings which follow the plates seem occasionally to lose sight of it. On the other hand I hasten to express my profound admiration for the vast amount of pertinent and fresh information which Dr. Josefine Rumpf imparts to the reader in the 134 pages of the catalogue. Through her efforts, this has become an indispensable reference work for

historians of art and of literature; a careful bibliography, listing references to each individual painting in the collection, greatly enhances its value.

It is very gratifying to see that works of this kind are again being published in Germany, and I am seizing upon this opportunity to call the reader's attention to the fact that the old *desideratum* of an edition of the *Italienische Reise* with exhaustive art-historical comment has just been fulfilled in the most satisfactory manner (*Goethe, Italienische Reise*, herausgegeben und erläutert von Herbert von Einem, textkritisch durchgesehen von Erich Trunz, Hamburg, Christian Wegner, 1951).

WOLFGANG STECHOW

Oberlin College

BRIEF MENTION

Zeitschrift für Deutsches Altertum und Deutsche Literatur. Hrg. v. JULIUS SCHWIETERING. LXXXII. Band (zugleich LXIV. des *Anzeigers*). Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag, 1950. Pp. 98 + 40. DM. 11.—Die *Zeitschrift* ist wieder da! Seit 1944 war die ehrwürdige, vor 110 Jahren gegründete, nur noch mit jahrelangen Unterbrechungen stückweise erschienen. Der Tag ihrer Neugeburt ist der des 3. Heftes des 82. Bandes: der 30. November 1950. Nichts hat sich gegen früher geändert, weder die äussere Gestalt noch der Herausgeber, weder Druck noch Format, nur der Verleger, der mit Unterstützung der Deutschen Notgemeinschaft Zeugnis ablegt vom Erstarken des wissenschaftlichen Ernstes und der Wiederbesinnung auf die dauernden Güter des Deutschen Altertums. Seit *Schwietering* die Herausgabe der *Zeitschrift* übernahm, wurde sein Bestreben deutlich, eine durch Roethe beförderte Bombastik des Tons, durch Edward Schröder noch verstärkte Apodiktik und donnernde Forschheit auf erträgliches Maß herabzustimmen. Unter *Schwieterings* Redaktion wird sich das Primadonnen-Getöse zum rein abgestimmten Orchester harmonisieren.

Im vorliegenden Heft liefert Baesecke eine 40 Seiten umfassende Analyse des Mittelstücks des *Muspilli*, deren ungewöhnliche Bedeutung in einer Anzahl frappanter, dabei best fundierter Theorien über die Urgestalt des verhunzten Textes besteht. Das meiste davon scheint mir einleuchtend, andres wird durch Diskussion sicher noch an Klarheit gewinnen. Scholtes Beitrag zur *Simplicissimus*-Interpretation ist so reich und fördernd, daß es in sein gediegenes und vielfach anregendes Buch, *Der Simplicissimus und sein Dichter* (Niemeyer, Tübingen, 1950), ein Meisterwerk geduldigen Sammeleifers, hätte eingeschlossen sein sollen, zumal er hier über das dort Festgestellte hinausgeht. Aber ich ertappe mich

dabei, die einzelnen Aufsätze zu zensieren, während mein Anliegen nur ist, das Wiederkunft von *Zeitschrift* und *Anzeiger* zu begrüßen, wobei den letzteren heute wie je auszeichnet, daß die Besprecher den Verfassern, deren Bücher sie anzeigen, die Wage halten.

Man braucht die *Zeitschrift* keinem Germanisten zu empfehlen, sondern nur mitzuteilen: sie ist wieder da!

A. S.

Comic Theory in the Sixteenth Century. By MARVIN T. HERRICK. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1950. Pp. viii + 248. \$2.50. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. xxxiv, Nos. 1-2.) Like Aristotle, Spingarn left us little about comedy. He supposed that sixteenth-century theories concerned with it were "entirely confined to a discussion and elaboration" of the little that the master had introduced into his *Poetics*. After referring to this passage in Spingarn's treatise, Mr. Herrick points out that both comedy and discussions of it flourished in western Europe long before the Greek text of the *Poetics* was available there. The chief guide was not Aristotle, but Donatus in his commentary upon Terence. This work and other Latin commentaries down to that of Willichius (1550) are discussed in detail. The demands of rhetoric, the function of comedy, the concepts of plot, character, and diction are taken up in turn. A translation of "On Comedy" by Robortellus is added as an appendix. Mr. Herrick makes an effective presentation of a subject that in itself has unfortunately little of the comic spirit. So much the more is he to be praised for his labors, which extend the acquaintance of literary historians, interested in comedy or in criticism, to many authors whom otherwise they might have passed by without recognition. Here are theories that must have had considerable influence upon the production of comedies in western Europe. The book is admirably printed, almost without misprints, and has for its frontispiece a picture of Terence enthroned, Donatus on his right, Ascanius on his left, as printed at Venice in 1504.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

The Romanic Review is in desperate need of subscribers; cf. *PMLA*, April, 1951, pp. ix and xi.—THE EDITORS.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

- Blum, Hermann T.—Oliver Goldsmith: Eine Studie über die Anfänge seines Humors. Zürich diss., 1951. Pp. xii + 115.
- Capocci, Valentina—Genio e Mestiere: Shakespeare e la Commedia dell'Arte. Bari: Laterza Figli, 1950. Pp. 128. (Biblioteca di Cultura Moderna, 476.)
- Coffin, Tristram P.—The British Traditional Ballad in North America. Philadelphia: American Folklore Society, 1950. Pp. vi + 188. \$4.50. (Pubs. of American Folklore Soc., Bibliographical Series, 2.)
- Crane, Milton—Shakespeare's Prose. Chicago: U. of Chicago Press, 1951. Pp. 219. \$3.00.
- Craven, Delle M. (ed.).—The Neglected Thread, a Journal from the Calhoun Community, 1836-1842, by Mary E. Moragné. Columbia, S. C.: Univ. of South Carolina Press, 1951. Pp. xl + 256. \$5.00.
- Laws, G. Malcolm, Jr.—Native American Balladry, a Descriptive Study and a Bibliographical Syllabus. Philadelphia: American Folklore Society, 1950. Pp. xii + 276. \$4.50. (Pubs. of American Folklore Soc., Bibliographical Series, 1.)
- Leggett, G., Mead, C. D., and Charvat, W.—Handbook for Writers. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1951. Pp. xxii + 378. \$2.50.
- Moore, Arthur K.—The Secular Lyric in Middle English. Lexington, Ky.: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1951. Pp. xii + 255. \$4.00.
- Quinn, Arthur H. (ed.).—The Literature of the American People, an Historical and Critical Survey. By K. B. Murdock, A. H. Quinn, C. Gohdes, G. F. Whicher. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1951. Pp. ix + 1172. \$6.50.
- Rubin, Sven.—The Phonology of the Middle English Dialect of Sussex. Lund: Gleerup, 1951. 235 pp.
- Schröer, M. M. A., and P. L. Jaeger.—Englisches Handwörterbuch. Lieferung 8 (for—H). Heidelberg: Winter (1951). 80 pp. DM. 7.20.
- Sensabaugh, G. F., and Whitaker, V. K. (eds.).—Purposful Prose. New York: Holt, 1951. Pp. xiv + 578. \$3.25.
- Spencer, Herbert—Literary Style and Music including Two Short Essays on Graceful and Beauty. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. Pp. x + 119.

Staub, H. U.—Massingers Versuch eines Ideendramas. Zurich diss., 1950. 96 pp.

Thompson, Craig R., and Hicks, John (eds.).—Thought and Experience in Prose. New York: Oxford U. Press, 1951. Pp. x + 661. \$3.50.

Whitelock, Dorothy.—The Audience of Beowulf. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951. Pp. iv + 111. \$2.50.

Williams, Harold (ed.).—The History of the Four Last Years of the Queen. The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift, ed. Herbert Davis, vol. 7. Princeton: Princeton U. Press, 1951. Pp. xxxvi + 252. \$3.75.

GERMAN

Bach, Adolf.—Deutsche Mundartenforschung. Ihre Wege, Ergebnisse u. Aufgaben. xv, 335 pp. M. 23-50. [Germanische Bibliothek. Reihe 3.]

Baeseke, Georg.—Frühgeschichte des deutschen Schrifttums. (Lieferung 1.) Halle (Saale), Niemeyer, 1950. xii, 100 pp. 4°. M. 4.50.

Baum, Marie.—Leuchtende Spur. Das Leben Ricarda Huchs. Tübingen: R. Wunderlich [1950]. 519 pp. M. 16.50.

Beyschlag, Siegfried.—Die Metrik der mittelhochdeutschen Blütezeit. In Grundzügen. Nürnberg: H. Carl [1950]. 36 pp. M. 3.50.

Dahlberg, Torsten.—Zwei unberücksichtigte mittelhochdeutsche Laurin-Versionen. Untersucht u. hrsg. [Publications of the New Society of Letters at Lund. 31]. Lund: (Gleerup), 1948. 211 pp. 2 plates. Skr. 12.—
— Zum dänischen Lavrin und niederdeutschen Lorin. Mit e. Neudruck des einzig erhaltenen niederdeutschen Exemplars (Hamburg um 1560). [Lunds Universitets årsskrift. N. F. Avd. 1, Bd. 45, Nr. 5]. Lund: Gleerup [1950], 128 pp. 1 plate. Skr. 8.—

Daur, Albert.—Faust und der Teufel. Eine Darstellung nach Goethes dichter. Wort. Heidelberg: Winter, 1950. vi, 500 pp. M. 22.50.

Drexel, Albert.—Hans Eschelbach. Der Dichter und Mensch. Zürich: 1948. 244 pp.

Heidegger, Martin.—Erläuterungen zu Hölderlins Dichtung. 2. unveränd. Aufl. Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann [1950]. 144 pp. M. 6.—

Hofmann, J. M. B. u. Rubenbauer, Hans.—Wörterbuch der grammatischen und metrischen Terminologie. Heidelberg: Winter, 1950. 64 pp. M. 3.—

Holmberg, Märte Astdahl.—Studien zu den niederdeutschen Handwerkerbezeichnungen des Mittelalters. Leder- und Holzwerker [Lunder Germanistische Forschungen. 24] *Lund: Gleerup* [1950]. Diss. Lund. 278 pp. Kr. 18.—

Kessler, Walter.—Hugo von Hofmannsthal's Beziehungen zur bildenden Kunst. Freiburg i. d. Schweiz diss., 1950. 109 pp.

Kindermann, Heinz, u. Dietrich, Margarete.—Lexikon der Weltliteratur [Sammlung "Die Universität." Bd. 12.] *Wien, Stuttgart: Humboldt-Verlag* [1950]. viii, 928 pp. S. 75.—

Kluckhohn, Paul.—Charakteristiken. Die Romantiker in Selbstzeugnissen u. Äußerungen ihrer Zeitgenossen. Bearbeitet. [Deu. Lit. Reihe 17, Bd. 1.] *Stuttgart: Reclam*, 1950. 319 pp. M. 12.—

Kraus, Carl von.—Des Minnesangs Frühling. Nach Karl Lachmann, Moriz Haupt u. Friedrick Vogt neu bearb. 30. Aufl. *Leipzig: Hirzel*, 1950. xviii, 541 pp. M. 13.50.

Kunisch, Hermann.—Adalbert Stifer, Mensch und Wirklichkeit. Studien zu seinem klassischen Stil. *Berlin: Duncker & Humblot* [1950]. 195 pp. M. 9.80.

Kunze, J. M. L.—Lebensgestaltung und Weltanschauung in Hermann Hesses Siddharta. Amsterdam diss., 1949. x, 84 pp.

Lavater-Sloman, Mary.—Einsamkeit. Das Leben der Annette von Droste-Hülshoff. Mit 16 Bildtafeln. *Zürich: Artemis-Verl.* (1950). 487 pp. Fr. 19.80.

Maas, Paul.—Textkritik. 2. verb. u. verm. Aufl. *Leipzig: Teubner*, 1950. 31 pp. M. 2.30.

Müller-Guggenbühl, F.—Die Gestalt Wilhelm Tells in der modernen schweizerischen Dichtung. *Zürich diss.*, 1950. 143 pp.

Nabholz-Oberlin, Margarete.—Der Josephroman in der deutschen Literatur von Grimmselshausen bis Thomas Mann. *Zürich diss.*, 1950. 92 pp.

Panzer, Friedrich.—Vom mittelalterlichen Zitieren. [Sitzungsber. d. Heidelberger Akad. d. Wiss. Philos.-hist. Kl. Jg. 1950, Abh. 2.] *Heidelberg: Winter*, 1950. 44 pp. M. 4.50.

Rooth, Erik.—Saxonica. Beiträge zur niederdeutschen Sprachgeschichte. [Acta reg. Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis. 44.] *Lund: Gleerup* [1949]. 266 pp. 3 plates. Skr. 20.—

Roulet, L.-E.—Voltaire et les Bernois. *Bern diss.*, 1950. 248 pp.

Schindler, Johannes.—Das Bild des Engländer in der Kunst- und Volksliteratur

der deutschen Schweiz von 1798-1848. *Zürich diss.*, 1950. 168 pp.

Schlappner, Martin.—Thomas Mann und die französische Literatur. Das Problem der Décadence. *Bern diss.*, 1950. 270 pp.

Schmitt, Fritz.—Deutsche Literaturgeschichte in Tabellen. Bearb. unter Mitarbeit v. Gerhard Fricke. T. 2. [Renaissance Barock, Klassizismus.] 1450-1770. *Bonn: Athenäum-Verl.*, 1950. xix, 231 pp. 4 plates M. 13.—

Schrader, Ingeborg.—Das Geschichtsbild Fontanes u. seine Bedeutung für die Maßstäbe der Zeitkritik in den Romanen [Diss.] *Limburg-Lahn: Steffen-Verl.* 1950. 110 pp. M. 4.80.

Studien zur deutschen Philologie des Mittelalters. Friederich Panzer zum 80. Geburtstag am 4. Sept. 1950 dargebracht Hrsg. v. Richard Kienast. *Heidelberg: Winter*, 1950. 172 pp. M. 24.—

Taeschler, Hans.—Die Gründung Prags. Interpretation des historisch-romantischer Schauspieles von Clemens Brentano. *Zürich diss.*, 1950. 109 pp.

Turrian, Marysia.—Dostojewskij und Franz Werfel. *Bern: Haupt*, 1950. ii, 142 pp.

Wolfram von Eschenbach.—Hrsg. von Albert Leitzmann. H. 3. 4. 5. *Halle (Saale): Niemeyer*, 1950. xiii, 197; xvii, 215; xvii, 194 pp. M. 13.30. [Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, 14, 15, 16.]

Zink, Georges.—Le Wunderer, fac-similé de l'éd. de 1503. *Paris compl. diss.*, 1949. 103 pp.

DUTCH

Aken, Hein van.—Van den conine Saladdin ende van Hughen van Tabaryen. *Leiden: Brill*, 1950. 28 pp.

Antonissen, Rob.—Lyriek der Nederlanden. *Amsterdam: Wereldbibliotheek*, 1950. 156 pp.

Bauer, F., W. J. A. Asselbergs, etc.—Geschiedenis van de letterkunde der Nederlanden. 2 v. 's-Hertogenbosch: Malmberg, 1949. 412 + 414 pp.

Boer, B. de.—Studie over het dialect van Hindeloopen. *Assen: Gorcum*, 1950. 196 pp.

Bomhoff, J. G.—Vondels drama. *Amsterdam: Ploegsma*, 1950. xii + 162 pp.

Dale, J. H. van.—Zakwoordenboekje der Nederlandse taal. *The Hague: Nijhoff*, 1950. vi + 231 pp.

Debaene, Luc (ed.).—De Historie van Broeder Russche. *Amsterdam: Wereldbibliotheek*, 1950. xxvi + 31 pp.

Grootaers, L.—Methode bij het onderzoek von Latijnse en Romaanse elementen in de Zuidnederlandse dialecten. *Ghent*: Erasmus [1949]. 75 pp.

— De Nederlandse Dialectstudie in 1948. *Leuven*: 1949. 23 pp.

Heeroma, K. (ed.).—Protestantse Poëzie der 16de en 17de eeuw. *Amsterdam*: Elsevier, 1950. xxvii + 248 pp.

Knuvelde, G.—Handboek tot de geschiedenis der Nederlandse letterkunde van de aanvang tot heden. 's-Hertogenbosch: Malmberg, 1950. viii + 460 pp.

Laan, K. ter.—De boer in de Groninger letteren. *Amsterdam*: Engelhard, Van Embden, 1949. 192 pp.

Loggem, Manuel van.—Oorsprong en noodzaak. Het werk van Gerrit Achterberg. *Assen*: Born, 1950. 41 pp.

Nijland, J. A.—Joost van den Vondel, 1587-1679. *Amsterdam*: Veen, 1950. 377 pp.

Rhijn, Aleid van.—Joost van den Vondel. De dichter uit de Warmoesstraat. *The Hague*: van Goor Zonen, 1950. 56 pp.

Romein-Verschoor, Annie.—Silt and sky. Men and movements in modern Dutch literature. Tr. from the Dutch. *Amsterdam*: Querido, 1950. 98 pp.

Teeuw, A. (ed.).—Hariwanska. Tekst en kritisch apparaat. *The Hague*: Nijhoff, 1950. 100 pp.

Vondeljaarboek 1949. *Amsterdam*: Joost van den Vondel, 1950. 116 pp.

SCANDINAVIAN

Haugen, Einar (ed.).—First Grammatical Treatise; the Earliest Germanic Phonology. Ed., Tr., and Commentary. *Baltimore*: Linguistic-Soc. of America, 1950. 62 pp. (*Language*, xxvi, no. 4, Suppl.)

FRENCH

Abry, Bernès, Crouzet, Léger.—Les Grands écrivains de France illustrés. 2 vol. *Paris*: Didier, 1950. Fr. 1285.

Arland, Marcel.—Marivaux. *Paris*: Galimard, 1950. 271 pp. Fr. 390.

Baldinger, Kurt.—Kollektivsuffixe und Kollektivbegriff. Basel diss., 1950. 301 pp.

Balzac.—La Comédie humaine, éd. Albert Prioult. 3 vol. *Paris*: Hazan, 1950. Fr. 500.

— Eugénie Grandet, éd. Maurice Allem. *Paris*: Garnier, 1950. vii + 293 pp. Fr. 330.

— Eugénie Grandet, éd. Suzanne Collon-Bérard. *Paris*: Eds. de Cluny, 1950. 248 pp. Fr. 255.

— L'Œuvre, éd. Bouteron et Evans. 5 vol. *Paris*: Club français de l'art, 1949-50. Fr. 11,400.

— Le Père Goriot, éd. Maurice Allem. *Paris*: Garnier, 1950. viii + 376 pp. Fr. 230.

— La Rabouilleuse, éd. G. Picon. *Paris*: Club français de l'art, 1950. 362 pp. Fr. 465.

— La Vieille Fille, éd. H. Queffelec. La Duchesse de Langeais, éd. S. de Sacy. *Paris*: Club français de l'art, 1950. 363 pp. Fr. 495.

Bardèche, Maurice.—Balzac romancier. *Paris*: Plon, 1950. 393 pp. Fr. 450.

Baudelaire.—Poèmes, éd. André Ferran. *Paris*: Hachette, 1951. 287 pp. Fr. 225.

Beaumarchais.—Théâtre, éd. Baüer et Sers. *Paris*: Hachette, 1950. 313 pp. Fr. 200.

Bernanos, Georges.—Un mauvais rêve, éd. Albert Béguin, et 27 lettres de Bernanos, *Paris*: Plon, 1950. 361 pp. Fr. 1800.

Bertault, Philippe.—Balzac, l'homme et l'œuvre. *Paris*: Boivin, 1947. 243 pp. Fr. 225.

Bertaut, Jules.—La Vie privée de Balzac. *Paris*: Hachette, 1950. 256 pp. Fr. 300.

Bonfantini, Mario.—Ottocento francese. *Turin*: De Silva, 1950. xii + 307 pp.

Bousquié, Georges.—Expliquez-moi Corneille à travers *Cinna*. 2 v. *Paris*: Foucher, 1950. Fr. 150.

Bridenne, J.-J.—La littérature française d'imagination scientifique. *Paris*: Dassetonville, 1950. 295 pp. Fr. 480.

Buet, Patrice.—Poèmes français de poètes étrangers. 2 vol. *Paris*: Revue moderne, 1951. Fr. 600.

Calvet, J.—Essai sur la séparation de la religion et de la vie. I. Molière est-il chrétien? *Paris*: Lanore, 1950. 175 pp. Fr. 270.

Carrera Andrade, Jorge.—Poesía francesa contemporánea. *Quito*: Casa de la Cultura ecuatoriana, 1951. 532 pp.

Castex, P.-G., P. Surer et G. Becker.—Manuel des études littéraires françaises. III. XVII^e s. V. XIX^e s. *Paris*: Hachette, 1950. viii + 264 + 312 pp. Fr. 390 + 390.

Cazenove, Marcel.—Le Drame de Balzac. *Paris*: Delmas, 1950. 227 pp. Fr. 390.

Chakhachiro, Omar.—Proche et moyen Orient dans l'œuvre de Victor Hugo. Geneva diss., 1950. 228 pp.

- Chardon, Pierre.**—Expliquez-moi Balzac. I. L'Auteur et ses personnages. *Paris*: Foucher, 1950. 96 pp. Fr. 75.
- Chateaubriand.**—Pages choisies, éd. Fernand Flutré. *Paris*: Hachette, 1951. 96 pp. Fr. 40.
- Chessex, Pierre.**—Noms de lieux forestiers. *Neuchâtel*: Monnier, 1950. 48 pp. SFr. 2.
- Choderlos de Laclos.**—Les Liaisons dangereuses, éd. Pierre Charpentrat. *Bordeaux*: Delmas, 1950. xv + 419 pp. Fr. 350.
- Clark, Ruth (ed.).**—Lettres de Germain Vuillart, ami de Port-Royal, à Louis de Préfontaine (1694-1700). *Geneva*: Droz, 1951. 375 pp.
- Clédat, Léon.**—Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue française. *Paris*: Hachette, 1950. xviii + 695 pp. Fr. 650.
- Crosland, Jessie.**—The Old French Epic. *Oxford*: Blackwell, 1951. x + 304 pp. 25 s.
- Crouzet, Paul.**—Tout Racine ici, à Port-Royal. *Paris*: Didier, 1950. 64 pp. Fr. 180.
- Cru, A. L. and Aurea Guinnard.**—Le français moderne. 2 v. *New York*: Macmillan, 1951. I: xxii + 402 pp. \$2.72. II: xvi + 466 pp. \$3.20.
- Cuzacq, René.**—Histoire de la litt. gasconne des Landes. L'Epoque contemporaine (1919-49). *Mont-de-Marsan*: Jean-Lacoste, 1950. 99 pp. Fr. 400.
- Daoust, Joseph.**—Les débuts bénédictins de J.-K. Huysmans. *Abbaye Saint-Wandrille*: Eds. de Fontenelle, 1950. xi + 191 pp. Fr. 400.
- Delbos, Loyer, etc.**—Hommage à Giraudoux. *Châteauroux*: Langlois-Prévost, 1950. 96 pp. Fr. 250.
- Desbordes-Valmore, Marceline.**—Poèmes choisis, éd. Y.-G. Le Dantec. *Paris*: Hazan, 1950. 157 pp. Fr. 180.
- Desguine, André.**—Arcueil et les poètes du XVI^e siècle. *Paris*: Champion, 1950. 80 pp.
- Dondo, M. M. and F. Ernst.**—French Review Grammar. *New York*: Holt, 1950. vii + 311 + liv pp. \$2.20.
- Dubois, E. T.**—Portrait of Léon Bloy. *London*: Sheed and Ward, 1951. vi + 125 pp.
- Dumas, A.**—Le Collier de la reine, ed. A. G. Bovée and A. Guinnard. *New York*: Macmillan, 1950. xi + 231 pp. \$1.60.
- Félice, Th. de.**—Eléments de grammaire morphologique. *Paris*: Didier, 1950. 58 pp.
- Fierz-Monnier, Antoinette.**—Initiation und Wandlung. Zur Geschichte des altfranzösischen Romans im zwölften Jahrhundert von Chrétien de Troyes zu Renaut de Beaujeu. *Bern*: Francke, 1951. 223 pp. SFr. 14.50.
- Flaubert.**—Madame Bovary, éd. Robert Kemp. Présentation du procès par J. Desforges. *Paris*: Delmas, 1950. xx + 343 pp. Fr. 350.
- Mme Bovary, éd. Paul Vernière. *Paris*: Eds. de Cluny, 1950. xl + 450 pp. Fr. 345.
- Frison-Roche, Roger.**—Premier de cordée. ed. E. L. Leonard. *New York*: Harcourt, 1950. 284 pp. \$1.75.
- Gallet, André.**—Gymnastique phonétique franco-anglaise. *Paris*: Didier, 1950. 70 pp. Fr. 150.
- Galzy, Jeanne.**—George Sand. *Paris*: Juliard, 1950. 336 pp. Fr. 500.
- Gardette, Durdilly, Escoffier etc.**—Atlas linguistique et ethnographique du Lyonnais. Vol. I. *Lyons*: Inst. de linguistique romane, 1950. vi pp. et 312 cartes. Fr. 9000.
- Garric, R.**—Actualité de Pascal. *Nijmegen*: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1950. 27 pp.
- Gasser, Gustave.**—Georges Droux, écrivain et poète bourguignon. *Chagny*: Eds. du Cep bourgogne, 1950. 30 pp.
- Gautier de Coinci.**—D'une Fame de Laon qui estoit jugie a ardoir que Nostre Dame delivra, éd. Veikko Väänänen. *Helsinki*: Annales Acad. 5c. Fen., 1951. 87 pp.
- Geschiere, Lein.**—Eléments néerlandais du wallon liégeois. *Paris* diss., 1950. xxxiii + 364 pp.
- Giraudoux, Jean.**—Racine. *Paris*: Grasset, 1950. 69 pp. Fr. 270.
- Grammont, Maurice.**—Essai de psychologie linguistique, publ. p. Geneviève Grammont. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1950. 215 pp.
- Grimmer, Georges.**—Expliquez-moi "l'Art poétique" de Boileau. 2 v. *Paris*: Foucher, 1950. Fr. 150.
- Guerrieri Crocetti, Camillo.**—La leggenda di Tristano nei più antichi poemi francesi. *Milan*: Malfasi, 1950. 222 pp.
- Guitry, Sacha.**—Beaumarchais. *Paris*: Solar, 1950. 215 pp. Fr. 1600.
- Béranger. Le Second Empire. Monsieur Thiers. Clemenceau. *Ibid.*, 1950. 187 pp. Fr. 1600.
- Hervier, Marcel.**—Dissertations littéraires. 2 vol. *Paris*: Croville, 1950. 111 pp. Fr. 225.
- Hourdin, Georges.**—Balzac, romancier des passions. *Paris*: Temps présent, 1950. 253 pp. Fr. 315.
- La Légende des siècles, la Fin de Satan, Dieu, les Quatre Vents de l'esprit.

- ed. Jacques Reynaud. *Paris*: Gigord, 1950. 96 pp. Fr. 30.
- Hugo.—La Légende des siècles, éd. André Dumas. 2 vol. *Paris*: Garnier, 1950. Fr. 380.
- Hernani, éd. H. Gaillard de Champris. *Paris*: Gigord, 1950. 136 pp. Fr. 30.
- Les Contemplations, éd. André Dumas. *Paris*: Garnier, 1950. xlii + 445 pp. Fr. 240.
- Les Feuilles d'automne. Les Chants du crépuscule. Ed. André Dumas. *Paris*: Garnier, 1950. 325 pp. Fr. 190.
- Œuvres complètes, IX, les Misérables, éd. Michel Braspart. *Givors*: Martel, 1950. 47 pp. Fr. 2000.
- Poète lyrique, éd. N. Richard. *Paris*: Gigord, 1950. 100 pp. Fr. 30.
- Prosateur, éd. A. Muller. *Paris*: Gigord, 1950. 96 pp. Fr. 30.
- Les Voix intérieures. Les Rayons et les ombres. Ed. André Dumas. *Paris*: Garnier, 1950. 317 pp. Fr. 190.
- Jaffe, A. H.—Bibliography of French Literature in American magazines in the 19th Century. *East Lansing*: Michigan State College Press, 1951. viii + 27 pp. \$1.00.
- Jaloux, Edmond.—Les Saisons littéraires. 1904-14. *Paris*: Plon, 1950. 327 pp. Fr. 360.
- Janet, Gaston.—Poètes du terroir 1950. *Paris*: Eds. de la Revue moderne, 1950. 39 pp. Fr. 325.
- Jean, M. et A. Mezei.—Genèse de la pensée moderne dans la litt. fr. *Paris*: Corrêa, 1950. 232 pp. Fr. 330.
- Johannet, René.—Vie et mort de Péguy. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1950. 477 pp. Fr. 550.
- La Fontaine.—Fables, éd. Lucien Geslin. *Paris*: Gigord, 1950. 574 pp. Fr. 350.
- Lafuma, Louis.—L'Auteur présumé du "Discours sur les passions de l'amour": Charles Paul d'Escoubleau, marquis d'Albion et de Sourdis. *Paris*: Delmas, 1950. 100 pp.
- Lalou, René.—Maurice Barrès. *Paris*: Hachette, 1950. 189 pp. Fr. 200.
- Le Théâtre en France depuis 1900. *Paris*: Presses universitaires, 1951. 128 pp. Fr. 100.
- Lamartine.—Méditations poétiques, éd. Jean des Cognets. *Paris*: Garnier, 1950. 264 pp. Fr. 180.
- Laprade, Jacques de.—Le théâtre de Montherlant. *Paris*: la Jeune Parque, 1950. 77 pp. Fr. 380.

Larbaud, Valéry.—Œuvres complètes, éd. G. Jean-Aubry. 2 vol. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1950. Fr. 2900.

Le Roy, Georges.—Réflexions sur la tragédie, "Athalie" de Jean Racine. *Paris*: Letouzey et Ané, 1950. 64 pp.

Loiselet, J.-L.—De quoi vivait Molière. *Paris*: Deux-Rives, 1950. xii + 132 pp. Fr. 175.

Lortholary, Albert.—Le Mirage russe en France au XVIII^e siècle. *Paris*: Boivin, 1951. 411 pp.

Magny, C.-E.—Histoire du roman français depuis 1918. T. I. *Paris*: Eds. du Seuil, 1950. 355 pp. Fr. 480.

Mallet, Robert (ed.).—Francis Jammes, inédits, œuvres choisies, bibliographie. *Paris*: Seghers, 1950. 224 pp. Fr. 315.

Mansion, J. E. (ed.).—Harrap's Shorter Fr. and Eng. Dictionary. *London*: Harrap, 1950. 1640 pp. 21 s.

Marash, J. G.—Parlons français. *London*: Harrap, 1951. 104 pp. 6 s.

Marclay, Robert.—C. F. Ramuz et le Valais. *Lausanne* diss., 1950. 159 pp.

Marivaux.—Le Paysan parvenu, éd. Dominique Aury. *Lausanne*: Guilde du livre, 1949. 608 pp. Fr. 985.

Martineau, Lefranc et Lièvre.—Le Calendrier de Stendhal. *Paris*: Le Divan, 1950. 409 pp. Fr. 900.

Maupassant.—Correspondance inédite, éd. Artine Artinian avec la collab. d'Edouard Maynial. *Paris*: Wapler, 1951. xvi + 345 pp.

Maynial, Edouard (ed.).—Anthologie des poètes du XIX^e s. *Paris*: Hachette, 1950. iii + 522 pp. Fr. 290.

Meister, Guido.—Gestalt und Bedeutung der Frau im Werk Jean Giraudoux'. *Basel* diss., 1951.

Mélanges d'histoire du théâtre du moyen âge et de la Renaissance offerts à Gustave Cohen. *Paris*: Nizet, 1950. 294 pp.

Mélanges d'histoire littéraire offerts à Daniel Mornet. *Paris*: Nizet, 1951. xxiv + 231 pp.

Méras, E. A. and M. A. Pei.—First-year French. *New York*: Dryden, 1950. xxx + 508 pp. \$2.90.

Merquiol, André.—La Côte d'Azur dans la littérature française. Préface de Jules Romains. *Nice*: Dervyl, 1949. 190 pp. Fr. 330.

Moffatt, C. W. Paget.—Science French Course, revised by Noel Corcoran. *New York*: Chemical Pub. Co., 1951. 351 pp. \$3.50.

Molière.—Théâtre choisi, éd. Ernest Thirion. *Paris*: Hachette, 1950. xxix + 891 pp. Fr. 420.

Muller, Armand.—La Poésie religieuse catholique de Marot à Malherbe. *Paris*: Procure de l'Assomption, 1950. 296 pp. Fr. 450.

Murray, J. P.—Selective English-Old French Glossary. *Washington*: Catholic U., 1950. \$1.50.

Nerval, Gérard de.—Les Chimères. Sylvie. Aurélia. Ed. Dominique Aury. *Lausanne*: Guilde du livre, 1948. 215 pp. Fr. 625.

— Etude de Jean Richer avec un choix de textes et de nombreux documents inédits. *Paris*: Seghers, 1950. 222 pp. Fr. 345.

Neukomm, R. R.—Die Bösen in der französischen Tragödie. *Zurich diss.*, 1950. 93 pp.

Niedermann, Walter.—Versuch über Maurice Scève's Dichtung. *Zurich diss.*, 1950. 80 pp.

North, Robert J.—Le Catholicisme dans l'œuvre de Fr. Mauriac. *Paris*: Eds. du Conquistador, 1950. xlv + 186 pp. Fr. 390.

Noület, E.—L'Œuvre poétique de Stéphane Mallarmé. *Geneva*: Droz, 1950. 564 pp.

— Paul Valéry. Etudes. *Brussels*: 1951. 200 pp.

Peters, Elizabeth and Sister M. J. Keeler.—Pour lire et parler. *Chicago*: Loyola U. Press, 1950. viii + 630 pp. \$2.80.

Peyre, Henri.—Connaissance de Baudelaire. *Paris*: Corti, 1951. 237 pp.

Ponceau, Amédée.—Paysages et destins balzacien. *In memoriam* par Marcel Bouteron. Introd. par Robert Kemp. *Paris*: Eds. du Myrte, 1950. xix + 251 pp. Fr. 360.

Potter, Harold.—Johann Friedrich v. Cronck. *Zurich diss.*, 1950. 71 pp.

Proust, Marcel.—Lettres à Bibesco, éd. Thierry Maulnier. *Lausanne*: Eds. de Clairefontaine, 1951. 181 pp. Fr. 900.

Racine.—Andromaque, ed. H. R. Roach and R. P. L. Ledésert. *Boston*: Heath, 1951. xlvii + 111 pp. \$1.28.

— Les Plaideurs, Britannicus, Bérénice, éd. V.-L.-Saulnier. *Paris*: Eds. de Cluny, 1950. 315 pp. Fr. 300.

Reclus, Maurice.—Le Péguy que j'ai connu. Avec 100 lettres de Ch. Peguy, 1905-14. *Paris*: Hachette, 1951. 192 pp. Fr. 250.

Richard, Pierre.—La Vie privée de Beaumarchais. *Paris*: Hachette, 1951. 285 pp. Fr. 350.

Rivoire, Jean-Alexis.—Le Patriotisme

dans le théâtre sérieux de la Révolution 1789-99. *Paris diss.*, 1950. 247 pp. Fr. 500.

Rode, Henri.—Marcel Jouhandeau et ses personnages. *Paris*: Chambriand, 1950. 238 pp.

Roncaglia, Aurelio (ed.).—Venticinque poesie dei primi trovatori (Guillem IX, Marcabru, Jaufre Rudel, Bernart de Ventadorn). *Modena*: Tip. Modenese, 1949. 112 pp.

Roulet, L.-E.—Voltaire et les Bernois. *Berne diss.*, 1950. 248 pp.

Rousselot, Jean.—De quoi vivait Verlaine. *Paris*: Deux Rives, 1950. 96 pp. Fr. 175.

Scarron.—Le Roman comique, éd. Henri Bénac. 2 vol. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1951. Fr. 950.

Segaud, Pierre.—Pages d'un journal poèmes, éd. Fernand Gregh. *Paris*: Ed. P. de Ronsard, 1950. 96 pp. Fr. 200.

Serra, Dante.—Il marchese De Sade. La sua vita e i suoi tempi. *Milan*: Ceschini, 1950. 306 pp. L. 1000.

The Song of William, la Chancun de Guilhelme, tr. into verse by E. N. Stone. *Seattle*: U. of Washington Press, 1951. xviii + 16 pp. \$2.50.

Souriau, Etienne.—Les Deux cent mille situations dramatiques. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1950. 286 pp. Fr. 400.

Stendhal.—Armance, éd. Henri Martineau. *Paris*: Garnier, 1950. xxx + 313 pp. Fr. 260.

— Documents iconographiques, éd. Henri Debraye. *Geneva*: Cailler, 1950. 55 pp. SFr. 10.

— Lucien Leuwen, éd. Henri Martineau. *Paris*: Hazan, 1950. xxxvii + 718 pp. Fr. 630.

Supervielle, Jules.—Contes et poèmes, éd. John Orr. *Edinburgh*: U. Press, 1950. xxii + 209 pp. 10 s. 6 d.

Swanson, A. B.—Elements of French. *New York*: Holt, 1950. ix + 218 + xlvii pp. \$2.25.

Tharp, J. B. and Simone Deléry.—La France en Louisiane. *New York*: Holt, 1951. vii + 107 pp. \$1.96.

Turgeon, F. K. (ed.).—Quatre pièces modernes en un acte. *New York*: Holt, 1951. v + 209 + xlvii pp. \$2.00.

Verlaine.—Poèmes choisis, éd. Y.-G. L. Dantec. *Paris*: Hazan, 1950. xxi + 525 pp. Fr. 690.

Vernieri, Nicola.—Il dramma della fedeltà. Sulle orme del Polliuto di Corneille. *Rome*: Ave., 1950. 156 pp.

Vigny.—Poésies. Chatterton. Ed. Robert

de Traz. *Paris*: Hachette, 1950. 285 pp. Fr. 225.

Voltaire.—Romans et contes, éd. Henri Binnac. *Paris*: Garnier, 1949. xii + 676 pp. Fr. 390.

ITALIAN

Ales, Carmelina.—Francesco Fiorentino letterato. *Reggio Calabria*: Giuli, 1950. 119 pp. L. 300.

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Filippo. Tragedia, ed. Emilio Santini. *Lucca*: Lucentia, 1950. 77 pp. L. 300.

Apollonio, Mario.—Metastasio. *Brescia*: La scuola, 1950. 152 pp. L. 230.

Arezzo, F. G.—Sicilia . . . glossario di voci siciliane derivate del greco, latino, arabo etc. *Palermo*: Tip. Greco, 1950. xi + 1054 pp. L. 3000.

Barincon, E. et S. Camugli.—L'Italie par ses textes. *Paris*: Hachette, 1950. iv + 440 pp. Fr. 490.

Basile, Giambattista.—Poesie napoletane a cura di Giuseppe Luongo. *Mazzara*: Ses, 1950. 81 pp. L. 250.

Bassoli, Vincenzo.—La poesia di Maria Barbara Tosatti. *Milan*: Gastaldi, 1950. 81 pp. L. 250.

Binni, Walter.—Tre liriche del Leopardi: il pensiero dominante, Amore e Morte. *Lucca*: Ed. Lucentia, 1950. 59 pp. L. 300.

Borsara, Guido.—L. A. Muratori, sacerdote e sapiente. *Modena*: Centro di studi francescani, 1950. 64 pp. L. 100.

Braccesi, Roberto.—Il problema del Parini. *Rome*: Bardi, 1950. 46 pp.

Calcaterra, Carlo.—Il barocco in Arcadia: altri scritti sul Settecento. *Bologna*: Zanichelli, 1950. viii + 528 pp. L. 2500.

Cappuccio, Carmelo.—Storia della letteratura italiana. *Florence*: Sansoni, 1950. xii + 815 pp. L. 950.

Caretti, Lanfranco.—Studi sulle rime del Petrarca. *Rome*: Storia e letteratura, 1950. 51 pp.

Chiereghin, Salvino.—Breviario estetico della prosa italiana. *Turin*: Sei, 1950. 233 pp. L. 250.

Cremonesi, Giovanni.—Stefanardo da Viterbo. Contrib. per la storia della cultura e della lingua in Lombardia nel sec. XIII. *Milan*: Vita e pensiero, 1950. 191 pp.

D'Annunzio.—Lettere ad Aldo Van Den Broek, ed. Mario Botter. *Treviso*: Lanfranco Baleani, 1950. 14 pp.

Falqui, Enrico.—Prosatori e narratori del

Novecento italiano. *Turin*: Einaudi, 1950. 470 pp. L. 2000.

Friedrich, W. P.—Dante's Fame Abroad. A Survey of the Present State of Scholarship. *Rome*: Storia e letteratura, 1950. 583 pp.

Getto, Giovanni.—La poesia di Torquato Tasso. *Turin*: Tip. Viretto, 1949. 172 pp.

Girardi, E. N.—Esperienza e poesia di Gabriello Chiabrera. *Milan*: Vita e pensiero, 1950. 126 pp. L. 600.

Jannaco, Carmine.—La critica letteraria dal Settecento al De Sanctis. *Florence*: Ed. Universitaria, 1950. 75 pp.

Lentini, Giuseppina.—"L'Italia liberata dai Goti" di G. Trissino. Modelli, fonti storiche, elaborazione artistica. *Palermo*: Cappugi, 1950. 51 pp.

Lopriore, G. I.—Saggio sull' "Aristodemone" di Carlo de' Dottori. *Pisa*: Tornar, 1950. 103 pp.

— Le "Satire" di Salvator Rosa. *Florence*: La nuova Italia, 1950. 92 pp.

Magnino, Bianca.—Storia del romanticismo. *Mazzara*: Ses, 1950. 287 pp. L. 1000.

Malagoli, Luigi.—Storia della poesia leopardiana. *Genoa*: Briano, 1950. 32 pp. L. 200.

Mariani, Luigi.—I grandi poeti italiani: Giuseppe Cocchi . . . Con due lettere inedite di G. Carducci e A. Cristofani. *Rome*: Signorelli, 1950. 46 pp. L. 400.

Michalski, Konstanty.—Le Gnoséologie de Dante. *Cracow*: Acad. polonaise des sciences et des lettres, 1950. 79 pp.

Migliorini, Bruno e Aldo Duro.—Pronunciario etimologico della lingua italiana. *Turin*: Paravia, 1950. xxiv + 628 pp.

Miraglia, Biagio, Jr.—Patria e libertà nella poesia di uno scienziato del '48. *Vicenza*: Stocchiero, 1950. 59 pp.

Monticone, Severino.—Nella miniera dei Promessi Sposi. *Turin*: Sei, 1950. 282 pp. L. 500.

Raya, Gino.—Il romanzo. *Milan*: Valardi, 1950. xii + 646 pp.

Sapegno, Natalino.—Il canto XXIX dell' Inferno. *Rome*: Signorelli, 1950. 31 pp. L. 160.

— Commento alle rime del Poliziano. *Rome*: Ateneo, 1950. 334 pp.

— La letteratura dell' illuminismo. *Ibid.*, 1950. 160 pp.

Sorrentino, Andrea.—Il frammentarismo nella letteratura italiana del '900. *Rome*: Azienda edit. ital., 1950. 261 pp. L. 1000.

Valeri, Diego.—Il teatro comico veneziano. *Venice*: Gruppo editoriale veneziano, 1949. 39 pp. L. 3.00.

Varese, Claudio.—Saggio sul Metastasio. *Florence*: La nuova Italia, 1950. 113 pp. L. 450.

Veneziani Svevo, Livia.—Vita di mio marito. Con inediti di Italo Svevo. *Trieste*: Zibaldone, 1950. 171 pp.

Wagner, M. L.—La lingua sarda, storia, spirito e forma. *Bern*: Francke, n.d. 419 pp. SFr. 29.50. (Bibliotheca Romanica, III.)

SPANISH

Agard, F. B. and Others.—Speaking and Writing Spanish. 2 vols. *New York*: Holt, 1951. vi + 165 + xxxiv + vi + 144 + xxxv pp. \$6.20.

Alonso, Dámaso.—Poesía española. Ensayo de métodos y límites estilísticos. *Madrid*: Gredos, 1950. 660 pp.

Arceo Beneventano, F.—Adagios y fábulas. Ed. facsímil de la publ. en Salamanca el año 1533, ed. T. Trallero Bardaji. *Barcelona*: Libr. Central, 1950. xxx + 249 pp.

Artola, G. T. (ed.)—Lecturas diversas en español moderno escogidas. *New York*: Vantage, 1951. 190 pp. \$2.75.

Barrios, Eduardo.—Cuatro cuentos, ed. Seymour Resnick. *New York*: Harper, 1951. viii + 158 pp. \$2.00.

Cabat, Louis and Others.—Cuentos corrientes. *New York*: Odyssey, 1951. vii + 211 pp. \$2.00.

Campos, Jorge (ed.)—Antología hispano-americana. *Madrid*: Eds. Pegaso, 1950. xvi + 639 pp.

Fernández Almagro, M.—En torno al 98. *Madrid*: Jordán, 1948. 240 pp.

Herrero García, Miguel.—El olivo a través de las letras españoles. *Madrid*: Sindicato Nac. del Olivo, 1950. 225 pp.

Manchester, P. T. and Jane Williams (eds.)—Joyas poéticas; Gems of Spanish and Sp.-American Poetry. *New York*: Ungar, 1951. vii + 253 pp. \$2.50.

Matluck.—La Pronunciación en el español del Valle de México. *México, D. F.*: 1951. xxvi + 215 pp.

Nason, M. R. and R. T. Campbell.—Charlar repasanda. *New York*: Oxford, 1951. 368 pp. \$3.00.

Orozco Díaz, Emilio.—Temas del Barroco de poesía y pintura. *Granada*: Universidad, 1947. 200 pp.

Pemán, José María.—Teatro. Prólogo de Joaquín de Entrambasaguas. *Madrid*: Escelicer, 1950. 2100 pp.

Ros, Félix.—60 notas sobre Literatura *Madrid*: Eds. Cultura Hispánica, 1950. 431 pp.

Simon Díaz, José.—Bibliografía de la literatura hispánica. *Madrid*: Consejo sup. de Investigaciones científicas, 1950. xxxii + 676 pp.

Soria Arteaga, Andrés.—El maestro Fray Manuel de Guerra y Ribera y la oratoria sagrada de su tiempo. *Granada*: Universidad, 1950. xv + 370 pp.

Tilander, Gunnar (ed.)—Los Fueros de la Novenera. *Stockholm*: Legas Hispanica Medii Aevi, 1951. 237 pp.

RUSSIAN

Buytendijk, F. J. J.—De psychologie van de roman. Studies over Dostojevski. *Utrecht*: Het Spectrum, 1950. 111 pp.

Fairbanks, G. H., H. E. Shadick, Z. Yedgar (eds.)—A Russian Area Reader for College Classes. *New York*: The Ronald Press, 1951. vi + 204 pp. \$3.00.

Maslenskov, O. A. (ed.)—Historical Chrestomathy of the Russian Language. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal., 1950. 52 pp. \$1.25.

Pabón, Jesús.—Bolchevismo y literatura (La novela soviética). *Santander*: Zúñiga, 1949. 181 pp.

Perry, J. W.—Scientific Russian. *New York*: Interscience, 1951. 846 pp. \$7.50.

CHINESE

Shau Wing Chan.—Elementary Chinese . . . for the teaching of modern Chinese at the college level. *Stanford*: Stanford U. Press, 1951. xxxii + 468 pp. \$7.50.

GENERAL

Cohen, Marcel.—Le langage, structure et évolution. *Paris*: Eds. sociales, 1951. 140 pp. Fr. 160.

Desani, G. V.—All about H. Hatterr. *New York*: Farrar, Straus, and Young, 1951. 300 pp. \$3.00.

Felheim, M., F. B. Newman, W. R. Steinboff (eds.)—Modern Short Stories [Mann, Field, Hardy, Maugham, Faulkner, Chekhov, Kafka, Mann, etc.] *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1951. 448 pp. \$2.40.

1951

ogo de
adrid:

ratura
1950

de la
jo sup
xxxii +

o Fra
ratori
Unive

s de la
banic

ie va
evskij
pp.

Yed
or Co
Pres

torica
guage
\$1.25
ratur
ünig

New
7.50.

Chines
ese a
ord U

ure e
l. 14

. New
1951

Stein
Mann
heko
ord U

61

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

Miguel de Unamuno's - - - - -

The CHRIST of VELAZQUEZ

TRANSLATED BY—Eleanor L. Turnbull

THE same skill which Miss Turnbull has so ably demonstrated in her translations of Salinas' *Lost Angel* and *Truth of Two*, in the shorter poems of Lorca, Alberti, Guillén, and others, is superbly illustrated in this translation of Miguel de Unamuno's *El Cristo de Velázquez*, the major poetical work of Spain's greatest literary figure since the turn of the century. The mystical serenity and deep religious tone of the poem is beautifully captured by Miss Turnbull. Without endangering poetic quality she has succeeded in the translator's most difficult task: retaining not only the sense of the original but also its form and movement.

Although all of Unamuno's work — novels, plays, essays, poems — is steeped in religion, *The Christ of Velázquez* pours forth his most personal belief in the Supreme Being. All the beauty of Spanish Christianity — its longing, its sorrow, its intimate expression of faith — is vividly portrayed in Miss Turnbull's delicate and exquisite translation. Through her efforts, one more of Unamuno's distinguished works (the first of his poetry) is made available to English readers, joining the growing list of his writings already published in this country.

Miss Turnbull, whose previous translations from the Spanish have so delighted her many admirers, has brilliantly succeeded in recreating the nuances and shadings of Unamuno's most beautiful poem.

\$2.50.

ORDER FROM

The Johns Hopkins Press • Baltimore 18, Md.

German
Short
Stories
OF TODAY

SCHUMANN
AND
WOLFF

This new text for college or fourth-year high school contains seven selections representative of German short-story writing during the last twenty-five years: *Der Hauptmann von Kapernaum* (WIECHERT), *Die Farben der Republik* (SCHWARZ), *Das Obdach* (SEGHERS), *Mira* (SAENGER), *Ein Bericht für eine Akademie* (KAFKA), *Die Flucht* (BEHEIM), *Kurzgefasster Lebenslauf* (HESSE). Each story is prefaced by a brief biographical sketch of the author. With notes and vocabulary.

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago Atlanta San Francisco Dallas London

Announcing

CHAPTERS on CHAUCER

by KEMP MALONE

HERE is the perfect book to accompany the study of Chaucer, written by a foremost scholar of mediaeval literature. After an introductory chapter which places Geoffrey Chaucer and the fourteenth century into the proper literary and historical setting, Dr. Malone focuses his attention on the poems themselves, exploring the poet's

methods, analyzing his technique, interpreting his stories in the light of the period in which he lived. The greater part of this work is devoted to a study of *Troilus and Criseyde* and to *The Canterbury Tales*, although the shorter poems come in for their share of critical attention. \$3.50

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND